DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 998 UD 021 071

AUTHOR Hood, Donald F.
TITLE Audit Report of the U.S. Federal District Court-Ordered Desegregation of the Dallas Independent School District, 1979-80.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE 15 Jun 80
NOTE 111p.: For related documents see UD 021 068-070. Appendices may be marginally legible due to small, broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Busing: *Compliance (Legal): Court Role: Desegregation Methods: Desegregation Plans: Elementary Secondary Education: Magnet Schools: *Program Evaluation: *Program Implementation: *School Desegregation: School Districts
IDENTIFIERS *Dallas Independent School District IX: Texas (Dallas)

ABSTRACT

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas mandated that the report to the Court by the Dallas Independent School District describing its progress toward desegregation be reviewed by an external auditor. This report presents the auditor's findings for 1979-80. The auditor reviewed the report and conducted on-site visits to a sample of schools. Findings of the audit verified district statements that progress was being made toward compliance: transportation of students was generally accepted by pupils and parents, and utilization of special resources through the creation of magnet schools was receiving the support of school administrators and teachers. Problem areas identified by the audit included the district's failure to include evidence in its report that confirms compliance, continuing difficulty with pupil performance in reading, and an inability to reach specific ethnic quotas because of unforeseen changes in the ethnic composition of student enrollment statewide. Recommendations for continuing progress toward full compliance were made. Evaluative instruments are appended. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196998

AUDIT REPORT OF THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION OF THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1979-80

DONALD E. HOOD

June 15, 1980

ETS

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

UD021071

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald E. Hood

ETS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AUDIT REPORT OF THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION OF THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1979-80

Submitted by

DONALD E. HOOD, ED. D.

Educational Testing Service
Austin, Texas

DR. L. DAVID WELLER
Local Coordinator

Members of the Audit Team

MR. TERRY DARRYL AIKEN

MS. SHIRLEY L. SMITH

MR. CURTIS MARCUS WARREN

June 15, 1980

Providing administrative support at Educational Testing Service:

DR. SCARVIA B. ANDERSON, Senior Vice President

DR. REGINALD CORDER, Director, Southwestern Regional Office

Providing assistance in preparation of report drafts:

MARY MENNINGER CORDER

REGINALD CORDER

INTRODUCTION

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, issued a Final Order dated April 7, 1976, in the case of Eddie Mitchell Tasby, et al, vs. Dr. Nolan Estes, et al, Superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD). The Order adopted the concepts embodied in the school desegregation plan of the educational task force of the Dallas Alliance, a tri-ethnic committee appointed by the Court and drawn from the total Dallas community.

The Court Order of April 7, 1976, was highly specific in how the district was to be divided into subdistricts for study and reporting; the proportions of students of various ethnic groups that were to be assigned to schools of different kinds in various subdistricts; how instructional and administrative staff were to be apportioned among the schools of various types and districts; how special school facilities were to be made available widely to students of all ethnic backgrounds; how preferences of students and their parents with regard to majority-minority proportions in the schools they attend could be accommodated - to a total of fourteen major directives and more than a dozen lesser subdirectives upon which the DISD was to report its progress in an Internal Accountability Report, filed with the Court on December 15 and April 15 annually through the school year 1978-79. The DISD did indeed file such reports in December 1976, April 1977, December 1977, April 1978, December 1978, and April 1979. In each case, the report of the school district was arranged to match the

Order of the Court, item for item, in sequence and format, to facilitate comparison of Court-ordered performance with actual performance.

One of the conditions contained in the Court Order of April 7, 1976, (Section XV-B) provided for appointment of one external educational auditor. On the basis of competitive bidding, Educational Testing Service (ETS) was selected to perform the external audit function. The audit was to consist of verifying each item in the reports of the school system pursuant to compliance with the Court Order. Stated another way, the "audit" was assumed by the school district and the External Auditor to consist of an auditor's examination of the Internal Accountability Reports of the DISD and comparison of what the district says it is doing in compliance with the Court Order - with what the Auditor has found to be true in separately collected evidence. As a consequence, the Court has had before it in each of the three school years covered by the Order, an accountability report from the school district describing its progress toward complete compliance with the Court Order of June 7, 1976 and an outside auditor's report covering exactly the same items and describing that auditor's conclusions about the progress of the school district toward compliance.

On June 12, 1979, the Honorable William M. Taylor, Jr., issued an Order Continuing Certain Provisions of the Court's April 7, 1976 Final Order. Under provisions of the continuation, the DISD was ordered to continue to report to the Court certain parts of the April 7, 1976, Final Order. Also included in the same continuation was the External Audit function performed by Educational Testing Service (ETS). The DISD has prepared and sent to the Court the Internal Accountability

Reports dated December 15, 1979, and April 15, 1980. So that the Court might enjoy the greatest convenience in comparing what the school district says with what the External Auditor says, this External Auditor's report also is arranged to match the Court Order and the internal report in both sequence of topics and in format of presentations.

There is in this report very little specialized language that will be unfamiliar to a nontechnical reader - with the possible exception of names given to schools with special facilities. At every level above the primary grade, there are certain schools that have equipment - or curricula, or schedules, or teachers with specialized training - not found in all of the other schools of the district. They are special schools for which particular provisions are made to bring to them the students who need them most.

In Grades 4-6, these schools with special facilities are collectively called "Vanguard" Schools. In Grades 7-8, they are named "Academy" Schools, and in Grades 9-12, they are known as "Magnet" Schools. A Magnet High School, for example, might be one that has the special equipment and trained staff to offer computer training, while another might be a high school that offers career preparation in the creative arts.

Table of Contents

Introduction	i
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Summary	1
Recommendations	5
DISD Internal Accountability Reports - December 15, 1979 - April 15, 1980	7
1. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools	9
2. The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, being transported for desegregation purposes to 4-6 and 7-8 centers and to Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools	14
3. Majority to Minority Transfers	
(a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity and by school, participating in the program	16
(b) The transportation facilities available and the convenience of transportation	19
(c) Efforts made by the DISD to increase student participation in the Majority to Minority Transfer Program	19
4. The number and percentage of Hispanic pupils participating in the Minority to Majority Transfer Program	21
5. The status of the following programs:	
(a) The Early Childhood Education Program (K-3)	23
(b) 4-8 Vanguard and Academy Programs	28
(c) 9-12 Magnet Programs	41
(d) Bilingual Education Program	45
(e) The Multicultural Social Studies Program (MSSP)	51
6. The number and percentage of teachers, by ethnicity, assigned full-time in each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet Schools	56

Table of Contents, Cont'd.

7. The progress toward affirmative action in attaining the recruiting and employment goal, including the number and percentage of new teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, engaged by the DISD 59

8. The current status of capital outlay projects and allocation of bond issue funds in relation to the priorities and programs established by this Order 63

9. The results of the district's annual standardized achievement tests program by school, grade (grades 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 12), and by ethnicity 65

10. Efforts made by the DISD to successfully implement the Order of this Court with regard to parent involvement efforts, staff development programs, communications and relations with the community, student leadership training programs, and provisions for safety and security (including due process procedures) 68

11. The Parent-Student Attitudinal Survey 77

Appendices 82

List of Tables

		Page
1.	Pupil Popultation, Grades K-12 By Ethnicity from December 1, 1975 - October 26, 1979	13
2.	Parent Involvement in Six Selected K-3 Programs	25
3.	Reading Levels at All Vanguard Schools, Grades 4-6	34
4.	Bilingual Schools Visited, By Subdistrict, By Grade	47
5.	Bilingual Teaching Resources Found In A Sample of Nineteen Schools Visited	50
6.	Parent Attitudinal Survey	80

SUMMARY

As External Auditor for the Court, under the terms of the Final Order of April 7, 1976, and an Order Continuing Certain Provisions of the Court's Final Order, issued on June 12, 1979, of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Educational Testing Service (ETS), Southwestern Regional Office, has audited the Report to the Court of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) for the school year 1979-80. In addition, the External Auditor has conducted on-site visits to a rotated sample of schools to ascertain for the Court certain specified conditions in those schools pertaining to conditions of facilities, curricular offerings, amount and allocations of education resources, and the involvement of schools with parents and community.

No serious difficulties were encountered by the External Auditor in performance of the audit. School administrators and staff, both at the central office and in the schools, were cooperative and helpful.

The characteristics of the Dallas schools reported to the Court in the Audit Report of June 15, 1977, generally continued to be true of the system in June of 1978, June of 1979 and June of 1980. The DISD reports to the Court for both December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 contain a change in terminology from that used in its reports to the Court in previous years. Previously, the DISD reports to the Court referred to Mexican-Americans; however, in its reports to the Court in December of 1979 and April 1980, the district elected to use the term Hispanics instead. In order to maintain continuity wherever possible, the Auditor has also used the term Hispanic when reference is used to the DISD reports of December 1979 and April 1980.

The reports of the district to the Court are still deficient in that evidence which illustrates compliance is omitted as appendices to the Court Reports, in the view of the Auditor. Mention was made of this disservice that the district does itself in the Audit Report of 1979, and even though some parts of the district's reports were more detailed in the December 1979 and April 1980 reports, there still remains an enormous amount of new materials and services that have gone unreported. Such evidence likely will remain unnoticed unless the district appends it to its report to the Court. The Auditor has viewed impressive materials and new and innovative programs but fears that public knowledge about such developments will not be widespread unless appended to the reports to the Court.

The Auditor still finds evidence that many students of the DISD are having problems with performance in reading. Such observations are not new, but the district should be reminded to continue its efforts to improve reading skills of all students at every academic level.

The test data reported in the district's December 1979 report provided the results of spring 1978 testing. As mentioned on page three (3) of the Audit Report of June 1979, the district changed phase testing in the spring of 1978. The Auditor understands that the district is presently working on equating procedures which will yield more accurate interpretation of systemwide test results. It is further understood that very little change was observed in systemwide test scores from spring 1978 and spring 1979.

Mention was made of possible confusion concerning the interpretation of the terms (1) "Due process" and (2) "Status" by the lay reader, some members of the school staff and audit team. Even though there was some

improvement in the use of the term "Status" in the district's reports to the Court in December 1979 and April 1980, there still exists a need for more detailed information to ennance the understanding of the Court in reference to "Status." There still exists a lack of understanding of the term "Due process" as intended by the district in its reports to the Court.

Because of a dramatic decline in the number of Anglo students in the DISD, the use of the word "minority" should be used with care. In reference to numbers of students, Anglos and Hispanics are now in the minority, and Blacks constitute the majority. However, in some instances the word minority also refers to racial or ethnic groups (i.e. Black, Hispanic). The district has elected to report Native Americans and Orientals under the general classification of Anglo in its reports to the Court. Therefore, the reader should be cautioned to interpret the word "minority" in context wherever it appears in the text of the reports to the Court.

Desegregation of schools in the district is, for the most part, being implemented without difficulty. Transportation of students for the combined purposes of desegregation and equitable sharing of specialized facilities continues to be accepted by the generality of pupils and parents. The DISD system for utilization of special resources through creation of Vanguard Schools, Academies and Magnet Schools appears to have earned general support of school administration and teaching staff. The Magnet Schools in particular seem to be attracting the students for which they were established. Curricula in each of the clusters in the Magnet Schools are continuously being refined. The Auditor believes, that overall, the Dallas Independent School District - as it reports to the Court in its own statements of December 15, 1977 and

April 15, 1978, December 15, 1978 and April 15, 1979, December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 - is continuing to make progress toward compliance in most areas specified in the Court Order. In some instances, particularly those where ethnic quotas are specified in the Court Order, the district is unable to comply because of unforeseen changes in the ethnic composition of the student enrollment systemwide.

This report by Educational Testing Service is, as was its report for 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79, an auditor's report. That is, it attests to the truth and accuracy of what the Dallas Independent School District has said about its own compliance with the Court's Order of April 7, 1976 and an Order Continuing Certain Provisions of the Court's Final Order, issued on June 12, 1979. The district has reported on its progress toward compliance with the specifics on the Court's Order, and the External Auditor has verified the statements of the district report, item by item, with qualifying comments. No effort has been made in this enterprise to evaluate the quality of education offered in the Dallas schools, nor has any attempt been made to generalize about the equities of the system with regard to ethnic and other cultural characteristics of pupils.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The DISD should be recognized by the Court for continuing to make general progress toward full compliance with the Court's Order of April 7, 1976, and an Order Continuing Certain Provisions of the Court's Final Order, issued on June 12, 1979. The district's reports may still have some shortcomings in communication and presentation of evidence that should become a part of the exhibits to the Court, but they reflect quite accurately both the intent and extent of performance in complaince.

1. The Auditor again reports, as in previous years, that materials that constitute evidence of compliance (pamphlets for parents, special notices and publications, visual and sound tapes, minutes of meetings, etc.) should be included as appendices in the district's own reports to the Court, rather than released separately to the Auditor. Such evidence, the Auditor believes, will serve as visual documentation of the extent to which the district has gone in its efforts to be in compliance with the Court Order.

2. The Auditor continues to reiterate the need to focus attention on the mastery of basic skills at all grade levels. Even though there was some evidence of slight improvement in reading skills for some students in some programs, the improvements are not believed to be large enough to suggest any relaxation of emphasis on the mastery of basic skills at all academic levels, particularly at the earliest levels of academic pursuits.

3. The results of the districtwide testing program should be shared with the instructional staff from every level (teachers, instructional supervisors, curriculum developers and others). The district administered three test instruments districtwide during the year. The results of these

instruments should be shared with staff at the building level for students in each building. Efforts should be made to determine the extent to which each instrument administered actually reflected the skills and curriculum taught in each classroom. Caution should be exercised not to overinterpret results of any instruments.

4. Magnet Schools appear to be attracting and providing training for the kinds of students for which they were designed. Enthusiasm continues to be exhibited, for the most part, by students enrolled in the Magnet Schools. Support for the Magnet Schools was included as Recommendation Number 5 in the Audit Report of 1979; however, its importance bears repeating again. The Auditor encourages continued efforts in: 1) Recruiting techniques and procedures for the Magnet Schools. Magnet School information should be made available on a permanent basis, particularly in the middle schools; 2) refinement of curricula; 3) expansion of curriculum offerings to accommodate students with varying interests and achievement levels; 4) continued involvement of the community in all programs; and 5) the development of plans for the improvement of physical facilities for Magnet Schools.

5. The Court and the district should consider a possible expansion of the definition of the word "minority." In some instances the word refers to racial or ethnic extraction; in other situations the word could mean fewer in numbers. Because ethnic balances have continuously changed, explicit reference is needed by the reader to denote numbers of students or ethnic origin of students in the use of the word "minority."

DISD INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980

In its function as External Auditor, Educational Testing Service began its work from the base afforded by the two documents of December and April prepared by the district to report the extent of compliance with the Court's Order of April 7, 1976, and an Order Continuing Certain Provisions of the Court's Final Order, issued on June 12, 1979.

As in the previous rounds of reporting and auditing over the past three years, the Auditor used a variety of techniques to verify, item by item, statements made by the district in its reports to the Court. Information in quantified data form was sampled through a randomized system, but deeply enough to assure reliability of the sample. Also selected on a randomized basis were a number of topics for which data were traced back and verified in original source documents. Going one step beyond that for certain randomly-chosen topics, the data from all levels of reduction and summarization - tally sheet input to computer printout - were assembled and carried into interviews with persons who had contributed personally to the creation and reduction of the data. Every topic covered in the DISD reports to the Court was thus examined in one or more systematic ways. This Auditor's report indicates where the data were found to be accurate or inaccurate within the limits of error set by the Court.

One troublesome circumstance afflicts the gatherers of information about students in the Dallas schools: the student population keeps changing. There has been a continuing loss of Anglo students, whether from mobility of

families or other causes. Thus the proportions of students of the three major ethnic backgrounds projected by the Court and the Dallas Alliance to be enrolled in the special schools of interest simply cannot be achieved because there are no longer enough Anglo students to maintain the projected proportions.

In spite of the handicaps imposed upon the school system by the realities of a changing world, the Auditors--having cross-checked and randomly sampled and replicated and interviewed to review methods and verify results--have few criticisms of consequence but find a devotion to honesty and accuracy which is a pleasure to report.

From this point onward, the remarks of the Auditor depart from generalization and are directed, point by point, to the December and April reports of the DISD to the Court.

1. (a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools.

In an effort to verify student enrollment figures by ethnicity at each Vanguard, Academy, and Magnet School, as presented to the Court in the December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 reports, the Auditor conducted on-site visits to each educational center. The enrollment figures included in each of the reports were found to be basically accurate and substantially correct. In no instance was there a discrepancy, positive or negative, which exceeded the 5% variance allowed by the Court. Data appearing in the December 15, 1979 report to the Court were obtained from information extracted from the computer on October 27, 1979 while data shown in the April 15, 1980 report were accessed on March 1, 1980. The on-site information was taken from the C-56E/C-56S forms in each school, and from records kept in each educational center pertaining to new enrollments and withdrawals. The C-56E/C-56S forms are usually made at the beginning and end of each school quarter. In the interim a person from data processing feeds additional enrollment and withdrawal information to the computer on a daily basis. Thus, the computer is updated on a continuous basis and would be expected to be at variance with forms that are made only periodically. The computer is not programmed to store information that is not current; therefore, there is no way that information can be retrieved after the fact. Each building is supplied with a computer printout of enrollment figures, and any discrepancy in coding should be found by local personnel on each campus. Thus, with the capacity for built-in quality control, the assumption must be made that since provisions have been made for the process to be accurate, the product must also be accurate if the quality control procedures have been followed.

The degree of built-in accuracy in the data reporting system was found to be high. Three main sources were used to collect and verify the reported data. These sources, each one lending support to the others were: (1) Appendix A of the DISD report to the Court (the master computer printout containing student enrollment figures for each education center by grade level, sex, and ethnicity); (2) pupil enrollment forms -- C-56E and/or C-56S -- prepared by each campus administration and with copies on file at each center; (3) independent counts of students conducted by the principals at each of the schools visited.

The difficulties of matching computer-based data with hand-computed data, when the samples are taken at different times in populations that are constantly changing, lead to unavoidable small imprecisions in final conclusions.

(b) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity, attending each educational center except Vanguard Schools, Academy, and Magnet Schools.

Appendix A, the master computer printout presented to the Court, listed the number and percentage of pupils by ethnicity, sex and attendance areas, by subdistrict, attending the non-Vanguard, non-Academy, and non-Magnet Schools (the "regular" or unspecialized schools). The format of the printout, however, did not easily lend itself to the random sampling check procedures which the Auditor had expected to employ in verification of the Appendix A output. In order to rearrange the output data in a way that would accommodate the random sampling technique, the district would have had to develop and apply new systems of data collection and reduction. Such a changeover, according to personnel in the data processing department, would be difficult and inconvenient for everyone

concerned, and expensive. Therefore, with the assistance of Mr. David Martinez, of the data processing department, an auditing procedure was applied only to the processes for collecting and reporting the data. (The same procedure was used in this circumstance in previous years.) Using a separate but real set of pupil data, the whole process -- from collection of original pupil information through all the steps to computer printouts -- was observed carefully by the audit team. The process was found to be very accurate and the level of quality control high. The data reported in Appendix A, therefore, logically can be expected to be accurate and authentic.

As the Auditor has reported in previous years, declining enrollments of Anglo students in the Dallas public schools as a whole have made ethnic balances impossible to achieve, with the consequence that compliance with the Court Order with respect to ethnic proportions in the special schools has been only partially achieved. Table 1 reflects the changes in student enrollment from December 1, 1975, the date cited in the Court Order of April 6, 1976, as the reference date for student enrollment to be used in establishing ethnic balances for the special schools. As shown in Table 1, the Anglo enrollment in the DISD has declined from 42.1 percent of the total student population in 1975 to 33.2 percent in 1979. That decline represents a total loss of 15,807 Anglo students. Conversely, the Black student enrollment in the district has increased from 44.5 percent in 1975 to 49.4 percent in 1979, an increase of 2,143 students. The Hispanic population has also shown a marked increase from 13.4 percent in 1975 to 17.3 percent in 1979, a gain of 3,851 students. Thus, the enrollment of Black and Hispanic students combined (66.8%) is more than twice the number of Anglos (33.2%).

Care should be exercised in use of the word "minority." The Court Order uses the phrase "Anglo combined minority ratio" and refers to racial and ethnic sub-populations. In other instances the term "minority" refers to numbers of students. Combined minority was also used to refer to numbers of Black and Hispanic students. If the term "minority" is to refer to numbers of students, then the Anglo and Hispanic populations presently constitute the minority enrollment in DISD. If, however, the word "minority" is used to refer to racial or ethnic groups, then specific reference by name to particular sub-populations will be needed. In its reports to the Court in previous years, the DISD has included Native Americans, Orientals et al as Anglo. The careful reader might sometimes be confused by the use of terms because of present enrollment figures.

Table 1

Pupil Population, Grades K-12

By Ethnicity From Dec. 1, 1975 - Oct. 26, 1979

Date	Anglo	%	Black	%	Hisp.	%	Combined Minority	%	Total
Dec. 1, 1975	59,466	42.1	62,767	44.5	18,889	13.4	81,656	54.0	141,122
Nov. 16, 1976	54,398	39.0	65,228	46.8	19,775	14.2	85.003	61.0	139,401
Nov. 18, 1977	50,392	36.9	65,719	48.1	20,599	15.1	86,318	63.1	136,710
Dec. 5, 1978	46,402	34.6	65,757	49.0	21,997	16.4	87,754	65.4	134,156
Oct. 26, 1979	43,659	33.2	64,910	49.4	22,740	17.3	87,650	66.8	131,309

2. The number and percentage of pupils by ethnicity being transported for desegregation purposes to 4-6 and 7-8 centers and to Vanguard Schools, Academies and Magnet High Schools.

In an effort to verify student transportation figures as reported to the Court in the December 15, 1979 report, schools were randomly selected for visits. A total of eleven (11) 4-6 and 7-8 educational centers were selected, representing the northwest, northeast, southeast, and southwest subdistricts. The schools visited were: Burnet, Longfellow, Cary (northwest); Robert T. Hill, Bayles, and S.S. Conner (northeast); Fred Florence, Julius Dorsey and Nathaniel Hawthorne (southeast); and Stockard and Henderson (southwest). The transportation figures reported to the Court were compared to transportation records maintained in the central administration offices in each educational center. Information in eight (8) of the eleven (11) schools visited was within the variance allowed by the Court. Transportation data by Bayles showed that 26 more Blacks were included than reflected in the Court report.

Records at Stockard showed five (5) additional Blacks and five (5) more Hispanics plus two (2) pupils categorized as "other" were being transported. An examination of transportation information at Henderson indicated that no students were transported while the DISD Court report showed one (1) Black student. The reader should be cautioned not to place significance to the numbers reported above. A variance of five (5) percent could account for very few students, particularly when dealing with small numbers as was the case in the schools cited. The numbers were more accurate in the April 15, 1980 Court report than in the December 1979 report.

Student transportation figures at Vanguard Schools, Academies and Magnet Schools were also verified by on-site visits. Records at Amelia

Earhart (Vanguard) indicated that thirty-nine (39) more Anglo students were transported than shown in the DISD report; fourteen (14) fewer Anglo students were included on school records at Twain (Vanguard) than were reported in December. An increase of twenty-five (25) Blacks was found at Jackson (Vanguard) for transportation purposes than was shown on the December 15, 1979 Court report. Other Vanguard Schools, Lanier and Polk, were within the Court-allowed variance.

Each of the six Academies was visited for purposes of examination of transportation information. Figures at Anderson showed sixty-nine (69) fewer students being transported than the 359 shown in the December 15, 1979 Court report. Records at Sequoyah listed sixty-four (64) more than the 28 in the DISD report, and Greiner had three (3) fewer than the reported twenty-six (26). All other Academies (Atwell, Holmes, Spence) were well within the Court-reported figures. Transportation figures for all Academies were much closer to actual on the April 15, 1980 Court report.

Student transportation figures for Magnet Schools were updated on a daily basis, and any changes were fed into the computer through terminals located at each of the educational centers. Because student data are kept current, it is neither easy nor inexpensive to retrieve and verify data from previous entry dates. Therefore, the Auditor verified the computer data management system by which student record input occurred. Data entry and report procedures proved to be highly accurate with existing built-in safeguards. Quality controls, when implemented, should make the system as free of errors as is possible. However, there are no safeguards against human error.

3. Majority to Minority Transfers:

(a) The number and percentage of pupils, by ethnicity and by school participating in this program.

The sample of schools drawn from among those participating in the Majority to Minority transfer program for the purpose of on-site visits was selected from those with either a high number of transferees or a low number of transferees.

Schools selected to verify the December 15, 1979 Court report were: High Schools -- Hillcrest, North Dallas, H. Grady Spruce and Bryan Adams; Middle Schools -- W.H. Gaston, Edward H. Cary, and T.H. Browne; Elementary Schools -- James B. Bonham, S.S. Conner, Julius Dorsey, James S. Hogg and Urban Park.

High Schools: The December 15, 1979 Court report listed 155 transfer students from Hillcrest High School. Of these, 153 were Black, and two (2) were Hispanic. An on-site visit revealed a total of 145 transfers, a difference of 10 Black students than shown in the DISD report. Figures for North Dallas High School totaled 10 -- 9 Black and 1 Hispanic. An on-site visit on February 4, 1980 revealed 10 Black and no Hispanic. The Court report listed 162 Black students and 1 Hispanic were participating in the Majority to Minority at Bryan Adams. School records on January 30, 1980 did not list the Hispanic students. A visit on February 4, 1980 to H. Grady Spruce High School revealed that 121 Black students were participating in the Majority to Minority transfer program as compared to 113 Blacks shown in the December 15, 1979 Court report.

Middle Schools: An inspection of the Application for Majority to Minority Transfer forms revealed no difference at Edward H. Cary School from those shown on the Court report. The district reported 4 Black students

at W.H. Gaston. A visit on February 22, 1980 found that 5 Black students were participating. Similarly, the DISD Court report listed 15 Hispanic students in the Majority to Minority program at T.W. Browne and local records showed 17 Hispanics in the program.

Elementary Schools: With the exception of James S. Hogg School, the number and ethnicity of Majority to Minority transfer students in all elementary schools sampled proved to be the same as those included in the December 15, 1979 report to the Court. Hogg was shown to have 1 Black student participating in the Majority to Minority transfer program; however, local school records did not list any participants.

The reader should be cautioned about possible over-interpretation of the above cited discrepancies in the DISD report to the Court and the information obtained by the Auditor through on-site visits. First, the data from which the December 15, 1979 Court report was generated were obtained on October 27, 1979. The on-site visits by the audit team were conducted during January and February, 1980. Second, when dealing with small numbers of students, a gain or loss of a few students could amount to more than the 5% variance allowed by the Court. Third, mid-year graduations, school dropouts, transfers out of the district, and mid-year enrollments could account for any or all observed variances.

In order to verify the April 15, 1980 report to the Court, the Auditor employed the same sampling procedure utilized in the December 15, 1979 report.

High Schools: Four high schools (Hillcrest, North Dallas, Bryan Adams, and H. Grady Spruce) were selected for on-site visits for verification purposes. The figures at Hillcrest were the same as those reported

to the Court. The Bryan Adams records showed 10 Black students on May 1, 1980, and the April 15, 1980 report to the Court listed 1 Anglo and 7 Black students participating in the Majority to Minority transfer program. The DISD reported 157 transferees - 156 Black and 1 Hispanic -- while an on-site visit showed 143 Black students in the program. H. Grady Spruce High School was reported to have 2 Black student transferees, and an on-site visit on May 5, 1980 revealed 11 Blacks in the Majority to Minority transfer program.

Middle Schools: Figures at two schools (Edward H. Cary and T.W. Browne) were identical to those reported to the Court in the April report. Gaston Middle School reported 4 Black students as transferees. The on-site visit, dated May 9, 1980, found 5 Black students enrolled in the program.

Elementary Schools: Five elementary schools were selected for on-site visits (Bonham, S.S. Conner, Julius Dorsey, James S. Hogg, and Urban Park). Only one campus -- James S. Hogg -- had on-site figures that differed from those reported to the Court. Hogg reported that one (1) Black student was participating in the Majority to Minority program. An on-site visit of May 5, 1980 found no student program participation existed.

Most of the variances between reported enrollment figures and those observed through on-site visits were found to be within the 5% variance allowed by the Court. The discrepancies found between actual (on-site) and reported figures were more frequent at the high school level than at the middle school or elementary school levels. Previously cited reasons would still apply.

(b) The transportation facilities available and the convenience of transportation.

A member of the audit team conducted an interview with Mr. Travis Johnson, the Dallas Independent School District's Director of Transportation, on February 13, 1980 for the purpose of data verification. Mr. Johnson verified the fact that student transportation bus cards for the Dallas Transit System are provided where fewer than twenty (20) pupils are in need of transportation from one sending school to one receiving school. At the request of campus administrators, early and late buses are provided for students who are participating in the Majority to Minority transfer program. This service, which is conducted by the Dallas Independent School District, is provided to students outside the regular school hours to facilitate student participation in extra-curricular activities. A total of twenty-four (24) buses were used to transport students who were participating in the Majority to Minority program.

On-site visits were made to verify a sample of bus routes at two separate compounds. Visits at Earl Hay and Cobb Stadium compounds, both conducted on January 15, 1980, verified prescribed routes and transportation facilities for the Majority to Minority transferees.

(c) Efforts made by DISD to increase participation in the program.

Efforts made by the Dallas Independent School District to publicize and encourage student participation in the Majority to Minority program, as set forth in the Court-ordered transfer program, were examined by members of the audit team. Copies of DISD's "News" and "Principal's Memo", school board publications, news articles by both the Dallas Morning News and Dallas Times Herald, articles appearing in school newspapers,

display posters, television and radio announcements, and two brochures ("Building Tomorrow Today" and "Everything You Need To Know About Transfers") were provided by Mr. B. Rodney Davis, Director, School Action Center.

On-site visits to a sample of schools which were involved in the Majority to Minority transfer program and subsequent interviews with campus administrators verified the fact that sufficient time was provided for students to enroll in the transfer program and that printed information in the form of posters, brochures and parent and administrator newsletters were circulated to schools throughout the district. More than adequate evidence exists to indicate that the Dallas Independent School District is making positive efforts to promote the Majority to Minority transfer program.

4. The number and percentage of Hispanic pupils participating in the Minority to Majority transfer program.

As of March 1, 1980 the number of Hispanic students participating in the Minority to Majority transfer program is nineteen (19). This number represents eight hundredths of one percent (0.08%) of the total Hispanic student population in DISD.

The Research and Evaluation Department of the DISD obtained a computer printout on March 1, 1980 which showed that nineteen (19) Hispanic students were participating in the Minority to Majority transfer program. An examination of the printout revealed that eighteen (18) of the nineteen (19) students were transfers from Roger Q. Mills Early Childhood Center to the John F. Peeler Early Childhood Center. One student was listed as a transfer from Oliver Wendell Holmes (Academy) Middle School to W.E. Greiner (Exploratory Arts Academy) Middle School. Eligibility for Minority-Majority transfer is defined in the April 6, 1976 Court Order as: "Mexican-Americans who comprise less than five percent of a school to which they are originally assigned, may transfer to a school that offers a Bilingual Education Program. Transfers provided in this section shall be permitted on the basis of student-station availability."

Records at Greiner show that a student from Holmes originally requested a transfer under the Minority-Majority transfer program; however, the student was listed as a curriculum transfer. The student was found to be eligible for the Bilingual program as well as the Mariachi Program at Greiner. The change in transfer status could have resulted when the discovery was made that Hispanic enrollment at Holmes (6.7%) exceeded the five

percent defined in the Court Order for Minority-Majority transfer. Holmes does not have a bilingual program; therefore the student was eligible as a curriculum transfer.

Eighteen (18) of the nineteen (19) students were listed on the computer printout as Minority-Majority transfers from Roger Q. Mills Early Childhood Center to John F. Peeler Early Childhood Center. School personnel at Mills indicated that they had reported Minority-Majority transfers in previous years; however, the school boundaries were changed for the 1979-80 academic year and no Minority-Majority transfers were requested. Records at Peeler showed only curriculum transfers. A clerical misinterpretation of symbols on a student roster at Peeler accounted for the erroneous entry of the eighteen (18) students into the computer. There was also an apparent entry error for the status of the student who transferred from Holmes to Greiner.

Therefore, the DISD report to the Court should actually show that there were no Minority-Majority transfer pupils during the 1979-80 academic year.

The Minority-Majority transfer program is actually a specialized component of the curriculum transfer program. Less confusion might result at the local level if the Minority-Majority transfer program could be combined with the curriculum transfer program and not reported separately. Eligible Minority-Majority students would still be eligible as curriculum transfers.

5. The status (i.e., how the district is progressing toward accomplishment of the prescribed quality or condition in the schools) of the following:

(a) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM (K-3)

On-site visits were conducted to a 15-school sample of K-3 campuses, in five of the six subdistricts -- Seagoville being omitted, during the winter and spring of 1980. During each visit records were examined for verification of pupil enrollment, teacher assignment, curriculum content and correlated instructional strategies and techniques, student testing procedures and programs and both parent and community involvement. The following schools and the location of each by subdistrict were included in the sample: Northeast -- City Park, Hexter, Kiest, and Reilly; Northwest -- Dealey, Arlington Park, Bonham, and Navarro; Southeast -- Dunbar, Lagow, and Rhodes; Southwest -- Douglas and Juarez; and East Oak Cliff -- Darrell and Seguin.

Pupil enrollment information was easily verified at each site by an examination of the district's C-56E forms, copies of which were on file at each center. This form contains the name and ethnicity of each student, by grade level plus the name, ethnicity and teaching assignment of each teacher. Teacher assignments were verified by visits to classrooms at selected campuses.

One component of the K-3 Early Childhood Education program includes efforts to maximize the involvement of parents in planning, reinforcing and complementing children's learning. A specific DISD effort in this area is home-school cooperation in reading, PTA functions and volunteer programs to supplement regular classroom instruction.

Table 2, includes information about six K-3 schools, reflects data collected during on-site visits, and illustrates both maximum and minimum parent involvement activities. The pupil population of each of the six schools is delineated in terms of number and ethnicity and shows whether the school is predominantly Anglo or predominantly minority. Whenever accurate figures were available, data were recorded as to the total number of families represented in a particular school. Parent participation information was charted according to the number of parents involved in each of the three activities and indicates the percentage of involvement of the total parent population.

Arlington Park (an all Black school) showed 100% parent participation in Partners in Reading conferences. Bonham, a predominantly Hispanic campus, reported 98% parent participation in reading conferences. The third campus reporting high parental involvement (95.2%) in Partners in Reading conferences was Hexter. Three schools -- Douglas, Rhodes and Dealy -- indicated no parent participation in reading conferences. Participation in PTA was low at Dealy (0.0%), Douglas (0.0%), and Bonham (32.4%), while the remaining three campuses all had parent involvement in excess of 30%. The percentage of parents serving as volunteers ranged from a low of 2.9% at Rhodes to a high of 17.7% at Arlington Park.

District efforts to reach its goal of a student:adult ratio of 10:1 are laudable. Of the fifteen schools sampled, two (Hexter and Dunbar -- 7.7:1 and 5.4:1, respectively) surpass the stated goal. Juarez with a student:adult ratio of 10.9:1 and Douglas with a ratio of 10.2:1 came

TABLE 2

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN SIX SELECTED K-3 PROGRAMS

SCHOOL	Pupil Population									Parent Involvement in Selected K-3 Schools					
										Partners in Reading		PTA		Volunteers	
	Anglo		Black		Hispanic		Other			Number Attending Conferences	% of Student Population	Number Involved	% of Student Population	Number Involved	% of Student Population
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	Total						
Dunbar	0	0.0	371	99.73	1	0.27	0	0.0	372	196	53.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lagow	368	92.5	7	1.70	23	5.80	0	0.0	398	314	79.0	144	46.0	35	8.7
Hexter	137	94.4	1	0.70	6	4.20	1	0.7	145	138	95.2	110	76.0	15	10.3
Arlington Park	0	0.0	90	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.0	90	116*	100.0+	40	44.4	16	17.7
Kiest	212	82.0	3	1.30	35	13.50	9	3.4	259	236	91.1	170	66.0	12	4.6
Douglas	4	3.1	28	21.50	98	75.40	0	0.0	130	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	7.0
Darrell	2	0.4	656	97.00	18	2.60	0	0.0	676	473	70.0	107	15.8	4	0.6
Reilly	298	88.0	10	3.00	26	7.60	5	1.4	339	186	55.0	356*	100.0+	44	13.0
Navarro	0	0.0	290	88.00	14	4.00	25	8.0	329	227	69.0	49	14.8	22	6.6
Rhodes	0	0.0	375	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.0	375	0	0.0	22	5.8	11	2.9
Jaurez	4	1.9	37	17.80	166	80.00	1	0.3	208	170	82.0	33	15.9	25	12.0
Dealey	91	82.0	13	11.70	6	5.40	1	0.9	111	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	18.0
Bonham	46	13.2	12	3.40	289	83.00	1	0.4	348	341	98.0	113	32.4	18	5.2
City Park	27	17.6	77	50.00	50	32.40	0	0.0	154	57	37.0	36	23.3	24	15.6
Seguin	10	1.4	531	84.40	89	14.20	0	0.0	630	221	35.1	80	12.7	12	1.9

35

36

*Number exceeds student population because each parent was apparently counted separately.

closest to meeting the district's goal. Three schools, Arlington Park (11.7:1), Navarro (11.8:1), and Rhodes (13.3:1), surpass the existing ratio of 13.6:1.

In the area of curriculum and instruction, all fifteen (15) sampled schools were implementing the district's baseline curriculum and the use of individualized instructional techniques and strategies in varying degrees. Programs included ability grouping, individual tutoring, large and small group instruction, team teaching, and combination classes (moving students to higher or lower grade levels in certain subject areas). Student instructional activities, to a large extent, are determined at grade level by the use of the diagnostic-prescriptive technique and reflect student performance on teacher-made and standardized tests, as well as classroom observations.

Activities correlated with the prototypic enrichment program focus primarily on field trips and/or educational tours. Six schools (Hexter, Darrell, Juarez, Seguin, Rhodes and City Park) reported the use of the oral language laboratory facilities, while City Park, Rhodes and Lagow reported visits to the Ecological Center. One school, Juarez, took advantage of the educational benefits of the Mexican-American Heritage Center.

The Multicultural Social Studies Program was operational in each of the fifteen (15) schools sampled. The program is correlated with the basal social studies program, and instruction focuses around special kits developed by the district as well as teacher-made materials. Guest speakers, parents and interested community members representing different

ethnic minorities supplemented regular classroom instruction.

The Auditor's observations in the sample of K-3 programs visited are not intended to reflect the extent of all K-3 programs. They are, however, intended to provide the Court with data regarding the status of specific programs and the degree to which implementation has occurred.

5. (b) 4-8 VANGUARD AND ACADEMY PROGRAMS

The following Vanguard and Academy programs are in operation in DISD.

Vanguard Schools

The Vanguard program continued to be implemented at the following campuses: Mark Twain, Maynard Jackson, K.B. Polk, Amelia Earhart, and Sidney Lanier.

Through on-site visits and personal interviews with building administrators, selected faculty members and students at each of the five Vanguard schools, the Auditor attempted to assess the "status" of the educational program as it existed at each campus.

Mark Twain Fundamental School (4-6)

Mark Twain School has a student:teacher ratio of 18.3:1 with an enrollment of 348 students in grades 4 through 6. Of this number, 74 (21.3%) are Anglo, 261 (75.0%) are Black, 11 (3.1%) are Hispanic and 2 (.6%) are classified as Other.

As expected from a fundamental approach to education, there is a heavy emphasis on the basic skills or the "3R's." Extra curricular activities include a Student Council, a French and Spanish Club, athletics and a Computer Club. The Guided Studies Center focuses on tutoring and child guidance practices. While individualized instruction is stressed, on-site observation revealed greater emphasis on supervising students than on diagnosing and prescribing educational materials for each child. Thirty-six parent volunteers served as tutors and assisted teachers in conducting small group instruction.

The educational facilities are, in general, good to excellent. Discipline problems are fairly few in number, with 43 infractions. Four of these discipline cases concerned corporal punishment (1 Anglo, 3 Black) and nine cases pertained to suspensions (1 Anglo, 8 Black). The majority of the discipline problems are handled through counseling and parent conferences. A total of 348 parents participated in Partners in Reading conferences. The exact number of parents belonging to the PTA was not provided by the building administrator since a breakdown by ethnicity was not available.

Maynard Jackson Center for Individually Guided Education (IGE)

Maynard Jackson School has a student-teacher ratio of 22.9:1. Seven Anglos (1.5%), 652 Blacks (98.5%), three Hispanic (.45%) and three Other (.45%) comprise the 665 students enrolled at this Vanguard.

The IGE school stresses the individualized approach to learning and utilizes both peer and adult tutoring. Both external and internal facilities were in excellent condition, and there was evidence of the use of multimedia materials. Atlantic Richfield Corporation provided nine tutors and a variety of books and correlated materials to supplement the regular instructional process.

The majority of discipline problems was handled through counseling (52 cases -- 2 Anglo and 50 Black). Two cases of corporal punishment and three suspensions (all Black) were also reported. Extracurricular activities primarily focus on athletics, although creative dance, drama and choir are offered.

A total of 193 parents served as volunteers. They participated in the PTA, and were active in the Parent Advisory group. All 665 parents at the school participated in Partners in Reading conferences.

K.B. Polk Center for Advanced Studies

K.B. Polk for Advanced Studies had an enrollment of 136 students and 23 faculty members, with a student-teacher ratio of 5.9:1 in grades 4-6. Of the 136 students, 94 are Anglo (69.1%), 31 are Black (22.8%), and 11 are Hispanic (8.1%). All students are enrolled in a curriculum that is specifically designed to meet the needs of the gifted and talented student. Independent research projects are conducted by each student with direction and advice from the regular classroom teacher as needed. Several parents and interested community members serve as resource people to supplement the regular staff.

Instruction is provided in self-contained classrooms and students participate in the Junior Great Books program. Students also reap the advantage of Fabulous Friday which consists of a variety of mini-courses offered each Friday on a variety of student-generated topics.

Discipline problems are minimal with fourteen (14) reported counseling sessions and one suspension.

All parents participated in the Partners in Reading Conferences. Active participation was reported by the 103 PTA members and the 23 member parent advisory group. Sanger-Harris, Henry S. Miller and the North Park Civic League sponsored activities and donated monies for the purchase of books and materials for the Reading Is FUNdamental (RIF) program. Building

facilities were found to be good, and recreational equipment was reported as adequate.

Amelia Earhart Montessori School

The Amelia Earhart Vanguard has a total student population of 195, with a student-teacher ratio of 19.4:1. The student body consists of 66 Anglos (34.0%), 89 Blacks (45.8%), 38 Hispanics (19.6%), and 1 Other (.5%). The Montessori instructional technique was originally planned to follow the district's baseline curriculum and, therefore, reflects the goals and objectives of the Management System of the district. Under the Montessori concept, an individualized curriculum specifically designed to meet each student's needs is provided. Moreover, multi-age grouping seems to facilitate individualized instructional efforts. Efforts to implement the personalized instructional model are accomplished through a daily academic-based contract between faculty and each student on a daily basis, in consultation with faculty members. Few discipline problems were encountered, and no cases of corporal punishment or suspensions were reported. Out of thirty-two discipline problems encountered, nine were handled through counseling and twenty-three (23) were resolved through parent conference.

Emphasis was placed on prototypic enrichment during the 1979-1980 academic year. In addition to a trip to the Ecological Center, visits were made to various museums, places of business and factories. Each on-site visit was preceeded with an overview of goals and objectives, and culminated with a post-visit observation and discussion. Building facilities at Earhart were reported as excellent -- both interior and exterior.

Parental involvement was almost non-existent according to the principal. A total of thirteen (13) parents comprise the Parent Advisory Group and there are no volunteers. Zales Corporation and Sun Oil Company support the Reading is FUNdamental (RIF) Program through donation of monies and a variety of instructional materials via the Adopt-A-School project.

Sidney Lanier Center for the Expressive Arts

The Sidney Lanier Vanguard has a 10.5:1 student-teacher ratio with a total of 515 enrolled in this school for the expressive arts. The total student enrollment represents 104 Anglos (20.2%), 83 Blacks (16.1%) 322 Hispanics (62.5%) and 6 Other (1.2%).

The educational facilities are generally good to excellent. The district's baseline curriculum is followed in that language arts, social studies, science and mathematics are foundation subjects. In addition, music, art, drama, dance and folklore are offered. Additional instruction in the creative arts, such as ballet, piano and folk dancing are conducted by volunteers from both parent and community groups. After school activities are primarily athletics, although Boy Scout meetings are also held. Remedial programs are also offered at Lanier. Emphasis in these programs centers around reading, writing and mathematics instruction.

Counseling (180) and parent conferences (137) are used to deal with student behavior problems. No cases of corporal punishment were reported; however, twelve students (2 Black, 8 Hispanic and 2 Other) received suspensions. One student, a Hispanic, opted for a Third Party hearing.

Parental involvement at Sidney Lanier is minimal. A total of 28 parents were involved in school activities. Eight parents were involved in Parent Advisory and 20 parents served as volunteers. No figures were available to indicate PTA participation.

Reading Levels at All Vanguard Schools

The reading levels for all Vanguard Schools are presented on Table 3. Data presented on Table 3 clearly indicate that the majority of Vanguard students is reading below grade level (873). Although a substantial number of students are reading on grade level (570), few are reading above grade level (394).

TABLE 3

READING LEVELS AT ALL VANGUARD SCHOOLS, GRADES 4-6

School	Ethnicity	READING GRADE LEVEL* Above	On	Below	Total Student Enrollment
Sidney Lanier	A	95	22	22	515
	B	36	10	46	
	Hispanic	12	32	236	
	Other	1	2	1	
Amelia Earhart	A	19	27	12	195
	B	11	45	36	
	Hispanic	7	17	19	
	Other	2	0	0	
K. B. Polk TAG Program	A	96	1	0	136
	B	18	12	1	
	Hispanic	3	4	1	
	Other	0	0	0	
Mark Twain	A	27	36	13	348
	B	26	103	129	(12 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	Hispanic	0	6	2	
	Other	0	0	0	
Maynard Jackson	A	0	6	2	649
	B	40	246	352	(16 students unaccounted for in breakdown)
	Hispanic	1	1	1	
	Other	0	0	0	

* Reading scores were obtained from a variety of different tests and represent the most current information available at each school.

ACADEMIES

The Dallas Independent School District offers six distinct programs for seventh and eighth grade students through the Academy programs.

Pearl C. Anderson Career Exploration Academy

The student-teacher ratio at the Pearl C. Anderson Academy is 10.2:1. There are 143 Anglos (40.1%), 191 Blacks (53.5%), and 23 Hispanics (6.4%), for a total enrollment of 357 students.

Curricular emphasis is on the development of career awareness through independent exploration and investigation of some fifteen major areas of the "world of work" as designated by the U.S. Office of Education. Students primarily use contracts as a source of program planning according to their perceived needs and interests and regular classroom instruction is supplemented by frequent field trips throughout the community. Computer assisted instruction and paraprofessional tutoring provide added reinforcement experience. Extracurricular activities include athletics, band, orchestra, choir, and a variety of club experiences such as chess and bridge.

There was a total of 122 discipline cases reported. The majority of these cases was handled through counseling (103) and parent conferences (171). Only two students received a one to three day suspension. No corporal punishment was reported.

All parents (357) participated in the Partners in Reading program, and 151 belonged to and participated in the PTA. The PTA members included 67 Anglos, 76 Blacks and 8 Hispanics. Eleven parents participated in Parent Advisory. Schepps Dairy provides transportation for school use in the

Adopt-A-School program.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Classical Academy

Oliver Wendell Holmes Academy has a student-teacher ratio of 17:1 with 259 students and 14 faculty members. Sixty students are Anglo (23.2%), 176 students are Black (67.9%), 21 students are Hispanics (8.1%), and 2 students are listed as Other (.8%).

The thrust of the curriculum is toward academic excellence in language arts, mathematics, and the sciences. All grades and classes are interrelated to facilitate students' understanding of their language and heritage. A member of the audit team verified that 169 were reading above grade level (44 Anglo, 112 Blacks, 12 Hispanics and 1 Other). Seventy students were reading on grade level: 11 Anglo, 51 Black, and 8 Hispanic. A total of 27 students were reading below grade level. Five were Anglo, 8 were Black, one was Hispanic and one was Other.

The majority of discipline problems was handled by counseling (52) or parent conferences (15). Only two cases of corporal punishment were reported. A total of 259 parents participated in Partners in Reading conferences, while 110 were active in PTA functions. Seven parents were involved in Parent Advisory, two served as tutors, and one volunteered to serve as an instructional aide.

Internal and external facilities were rated as being good to excellent. J.C. Penney continues to function as the school's adopting agency.

Sequoyah Academy for Environmental Science

At Sequoyah Academy there are 160 students and thirteen teachers for a student-teacher ratio of 15:1. The student population is composed of

71 (44.4%) Anglo, 69 (43.1%) Black, 19 (11.9%) Hispanic and 1 (.62%) Other.

A total of 96 discipline problems was reported. Sixty were handled by counseling and there were 28 parent conferences. Eight students -- 3 Anglo and 5 Black -- received suspensions of 1 to 3 days. Reading scores were obtained through on-site visits. Forty-seven students were reading above grade level, 89 were reading on grade level, and the remaining twenty-four (24) students were reading below grade level.

Although the building is old, the external and internal facilities were in good condition. One hundred and sixty parents participated in Partners in Reading conferences and 63 parents were supporting the PTA. Eighteen parents were involved with Parent Advisory. The majority of these parents is of Anglo ethnicity. Sequoyah has no Adopt-A-School affiliate.

William Hawley Atwell Fundamental Academy

William Hawley Atwell has a student-teacher ratio of 21.5:1 with 711 students and 33 teachers. The ethnic composition of the student body includes 219 Anglos (30.8%), 391 Blacks (55%), 96 Hispanics (13.5%) and 5 Other (.7%).

The curriculum emphasizes the basic skills (3R's) through a traditional approach to instruction. Individualized instruction, both on an individual basis and in small groups, is available on mornings before school and during the regular classroom day with both teachers and teacher aides.

Out of 658 students, 158 are reading above grade level, 251 are reading on grade level, while 249 are reading below grade level. The majority of students reading below grade level is of minority ethnicity. Extracurricular

activities center around athletics with additional offerings in band, orchestra and choir. Sixty-eight students participate in a Student Council class which is part of the Student Leadership Training Program. Although Atwell does not participate in the Partners in Reading Program, there is parental involvement in PTA (18), Parent Advisory (5), and volunteer work and tutoring (34).

Discipline constitutes somewhat of a problem in that 177 cases of corporal punishment involving 36 Anglos, 125 Blacks and 16 Hispanics were reported. Twenty students received suspensions of from 1 to 3 days, and a combined total of 312 counseling (135) and parent conferences (177) was held.

Alex W. Spence Academy

The Alex W. Spence Academy provides educational offerings for deaf and special education students (93), regular middle school students (447) and TAG students (107). The student:teacher ratio for the talented and gifted students is 11.8:1. TAG students include 84 Anglos (78.5%), 16 Blacks (15%), 5 Hispanics (4.7%) and 1 Other (.8%).

The curriculum is arranged so that TAG programs are conducted during the morning and TAG students attend regular classroom sessions during the afternoon. Regular students follow the seventh and eighth grade baseline curriculum for both morning and afternoon sessions. Extracurricular activities consist of athletics, band and drama. A total of 104 students participatesin the Student Leadership Training Program.

Reading levels at Spence are high. All TAG students are reading above grade level. Discipline problems are non-existent among TAG students.

Regular student discipline problems included six suspensions, 343 counseling cases and 226 parent conferences. Thirteen Third Party hearings were requested.

Twenty-seven TAG parents participated in Partners in Reading activities, while 30 belong to PTA. Six parents are in Parent Advisory and 12 serve as volunteers. School facilities were rated good to excellent and the Dallas Founders Lions Club provides tutors, money and other assistance under the Adopt-A-School program.

W.E. Greiner Exploratory Arts Academy

The W.E. Greiner Academy provides a curriculum that assists students in developing individual artistic interests. Program offerings include creative drama, journalism and creative writing, music, communications and cultural exploration.

The student-teacher ratio is 20.7:1. There are 429 Anglo students (36.4%), 170 Black students (14.4%), 563 Hispanic students (47.8%) and 16 Other (1.4%). This represents a total of 1,178 students.

Discipline problems at Greiner seem to be of the nature that resulted in suspensions from 1 to 3 days. There were seventy-one such suspensions. While there were no corporal punishment, counseling, or parent conferences reported, 18 students requested a Third Party hearing.

Reading scores indicate that 141 students are reading above grade level and 121 are reading on grade level. The remaining 864 students are reading below grade level. Ninety students are participating in the Student Leadership Training Program while 16 are in the Indian Arts Club. The Audio-Visual Club has 29 members and approximately 119 are participating in athletics. Twenty-six students in eighth grade and 29 students in

the seventh grade are enrolled in honors English.

A total of 563 parents participates in Partners in Reading activities. PTA membership numbers 171 with 122 Anglos, 16 Blacks, and 33 Hispanics. Six parent volunteers assist regular classroom teachers in conducting instructional activities. Honeywell provides money and instructional materials as the Adopt-A-School agent. Building facilities, both interior and exterior, were rated as good.

5. (c) 9-12 MAGNET PROGRAMS

The four Magnet Schools created by the DISD during the school year 1976-77 under Section V of the Court Order were the Business and Management Center, the High School for the Health Professions, the Transportation Institute, and the Creative Arts Magnet High School. To these original four were added two more Magnet Schools in the school year 1977-78: the Human Services Center and the Magnet Center for Public Services. Another addition was made in January 1979, when the Multiple Careers Magnet Center opened.

The DISD report to the Court of December 15, 1979 includes a detailed list of activities undertaken by the district to encourage young people to enroll in these special high schools; however, the district once again failed to append to its report copies of the well-developed and attractive promotional materials created to achieve this end.

On-site visits by the audit team indicated that the district does indeed continue to refine and improve the Magnet Programs. Special emphasis has focused on: (1) recruitment of students; (2) curriculum revision and development; (3) student placement in paid intern programs; and (4) the bringing together of students, employees, and parents in interviews.

In the course of the on-site visits, students in the Magnet Schools were interviewed, and, subsequently, interviews were held with their parents and employers or supervisors. All students interviewed were positive in their appreciation of the Magnet School concept and reported favorably on the training offered. Students were especially appreciative of the instructional staff and learning environment in their respective

schools. Individualized instruction and the genuine concern for students by the instructional staff and administrators were the Magnet School characteristics mentioned favorably by most students.

Examination of the enrollment figures for the Magnet High Schools showed that the self-selection of students for these schools still has not produced the racial balance in enrollments that was anticipated in the Court Order.

There continues to be a need to strengthen the reading skills of many students in the Magnet Schools. Remedial reading specialists were observed at work in all Magnet Schools for many students are being released into the job market with less than a mastery of basic reading skills.

It should be noted that the principal function of these special schools is not purely academic and, while they do provide a fairly generous amount of remedial instruction, they should not be faulted for academic shortcomings that students bring with them from other schools. Where to focus the remedial instruction that less skillful students need is a problem that is being addressed by the district leadership.

It is the opinion of the auditing team that the Magnet Schools are succeeding in developing the kinds of programs mandated in the Court Order of April 7, 1976, i.e. providing programs of instruction that do indeed prepare most students for further technical and paraprofessional training in post-high school institutions. Although some students enter jobs directly upon graduation from Magnet Schools, most go on for further training.

The community of Dallas has provided much support for the Magnet High Schools; such support and involvement should be continued. Any developing concept like that of the Magnet High Schools needs time for development and refinement. Dallas needs these schools and already has reason to be proud of them.

5. (c.1) Efforts of the DISD to encourage student enrollment in Magnet Programs.

On-site visits to all of the Magnet High School programs by members of the audit team indicated that the efforts of the district to promote enrollment in the Magnet Programs were as listed in the DISD reports of December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 on pages 21-25 in both reports. Not all of the Magnet staffs engaged in every one of the activities listed in these reports, but all of the listed efforts had been tried by some of the Magnet units and all of the units had taken part with enthusiasm in at least several of the promotional efforts.

5. (c.2) Course offerings in each of the Magnet Programs in operation.

On-site visits to all the Magnet High School centers and interviews with the administrators of those centers confirmed the accuracy of the DISD reports of December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 in describing the course offerings of the seven Magnet centers.

5. (c.3) The progress of increasing the number of Magnet Schools and their location in terms of the timetable set forth in this order.

As noted in the December, 1978 and April, 1979 DISD reports to the Court, a seventh Magnet School--the Multiple Careers Center at William B. Carroll High School--was opened in January of 1979. This facility offers training in general construction, laundry and dry cleaning, home and community services, furniture repair and upholstery, and building and grounds maintenance.

Visits to DISD administrative offices confirmed that the Science and Technology Magnet in East Oak Cliff will not be open in the fall of 1980 as planned because of inflation. Continued work on this Magnet has been placed "on hold."

Preparations for the opening of the Lincoln Magnet High School for Humanities are continuing, and the building is expected to be occupied in the fall of 1980.

In total, implementation of the Court's Order with regard to development of Magnet Schools and their strategic location at points of greatest need in the community appears to be either complete or in various stages of completion except for the Science and Technology Magnet School previously mentioned.

5. (d) THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Reports to the Court -- both the December 1979 and the April 1980 -- were far more delineated with specific program-offering information than contained within the three previous reporting years. However, unlike the previous Court reports, data reflecting grade level assignments and grades served by the Bilingual Program were not included. To include these data along with those which were presented in a new format, would have facilitated the audit process and provided more meaningful data to the Court. Since this was not the case, the Auditor selected to continue the verification system previously used wherever possible and report the subsequent findings to the Court.

Financial support for the implementation and continuation of the Bilingual Program comes from two major sources: (1) The Texas Education Agency, which provides funds for instruction in grades K through 5 under the Texas Bilingual Education Act; and (2) monies received under Title I, Title IV and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A minor source of funding is supplied through district monies which subsidize the Bilingual Program through local budgetary allocations. Also, state regulations provide for Hispanics who have been identified as Limited English Speaking Ability (LESA) students; however, some Anglo and Black students may also elect to participate in program activities on a space available basis.

In previous years, the December 15 and April 15 reports to the Court listed the names of schools, by grade levels, in which the Bilingual Program was implemented. Supplementary information regarding course content,

instructional strategies, teaching techniques and the like were not included in the DISD reports. In both the December 15, 1979 report and the April 15, 1980 report to the Court, the DISD reporting format was changed. Included were a list of bilingual projects and programs accompanied by brief descriptive paragraphs which included the number of schools, but not the names, in which bilingual activities were implemented, the approximate number of students served, and the target population for whom instruction is intended. To facilitate the audit process, the Auditor, on December 17, 1979, requested from Mr. Edward S. Kominski, Assistant Evaluator, a list of those schools in which bilingual instruction was conducted.

On-site interviews, conducted only once at each campus by members of the audit team, were designed to obtain information about program operations with campus-level administrators, resource teachers and regular classroom teachers in each of the nineteen schools visited. The observations reported by the Auditor could have varied had repeated visits been made. The bilingual observation instrument used in the audit process is included as Appendix B.

In each of the nineteen centers visited, efforts were being made to implement the Bilingual Program in accordance with the district's baseline curriculum. Instructional techniques included the use of large and small groups, a wide variety of audio-visual aids, a Spanish-English bulletin board designed to provide visual learning assistance to both the transitional and monolingual student, and a number of teacher-made materials for phonics and vocabulary development. Table 4 provides a list of the schools visited with bilingual programs.

TABLE 4

BILINGUAL SCHOOLS VISITED, BY SUBDISTRICT, BY GRADE

School	Subdistrict	Grades
Hillcrest	Northwest	9-12
North Dallas	Northwest	9-12
James Bonham	Northwest	K-3
Ben Milam	Northwest	K-6
Dan D. Rogers	Northwest	K-6
Bryan Adams	Northeast	9-12
Woodrow Wilson	Northeast	9-12
Robert T. Hill	Northeast	7-8
City Park	Northeast	K-3
Lakewood	Northeast	4-6
E. B. Comstock	Southeast	7-8
Julius Dorsey	Southeast	K-6
Leila P. Cowart	Southwest	K-3
Lida Hooe	Southwest	K-3
James S. Hogg	Southwest	K-3
James Bowie	Southwest	K-3
Benito Juarez	Southwest	K-2
Erasmo Seguin	East Oak Cliff	K-3
Harrell Budd	East Oak Cliff	K-3

Parents and/or tutors provided instructional assistance in one form or another in ten (10) of the nineteen schools visited. Leila P. Cowart reported the largest number of parents and/or tutors (24), while Benito Juarez reported twenty parents and/or tutors providing instructional assistance. The remaining eight schools: Erasmo Seguin, James Bonham, Lakewood, Dan D. Rogers, Bryan Adams, James Bowie, Ben Milam, and E.B. Comstock reported volunteers ranging in number from one to ten. Teacher-made diagnostic tests were used in all educational centers. In addition, PAL, LAS or TAS results were used for diagnostic purposes. In no instance was there reported a shortage of instructional materials.

All nineteen schools reported the use of either DISD baseline instructional material, teacher-made and programmed materials and/or books by commercial publishers such as New Horizons For English, Steps to English, and Rock n' Roll. A wide variety of supplementary materials were used to augment the more traditional resources. The number of certified bilingual teachers reported at each site varied in number and ranged from a high of nine (9) certified teachers at James Bowie to the fewest in number at Harrell Budd and Erasmo Seguin. Four schools had professional educators pursuing bilingual certification requirements: Bowie (2), Hogg (2), Roger (1) and Bonham (1). The majority of staff members expressed the need for more parent volunteers and instructional aides to provide more indepth instruction to individual students. The implementation of the bilingual program was found to vary from grade to grade and from school to school. There was a noticeable variance in the educational philosophies of some classroom teachers. Some teachers expressed a need for more direction from central staff. The district may need to focus more attention to

the possible developing trend for bilingual education in the Oak Cliff area which could be unique.

Table 5 provides lists of the bilingual teaching resources used in the nineteen schools with bilingual programs visited by members of the audit team.

TABLE 5

BILINGUAL TEACHING RESOURCES FOUND IN A SAMPLE OF NINETEEN SCHOOLS VISITED

Parent Tutors	Team Teaching	ESL	Audio-Visual Aides	DISD Baseline Materials, Texts, Teacher-Made and Programmed Material	Certified Bilingual Teachers
Hillcrest		yes	yes	yes	1
North Dallas	yes	yes	yes	yes	2
Bonham		yes	yes	yes	6
Rogers	yes	yes	yes	yes	5
Adams	yes	yes	yes	yes	1
Wilson		yes	yes	yes	2
Hill		yes	yes	yes	1
City Park			yes	yes	2
Lakewood		yes	yes	yes	1
Comstock	yes	yes	yes	yes	2
Dorsey	yes	yes	yes	yes	3
Hogg			yes	yes	2
Seguin		yes	yes	yes	0
Cowart		yes	yes	yes	7
Bowie		yes	yes	yes	10
Jaurez	yes	yes	yes	yes	6
Budd		yes	yes	yes	2
Milam	yes	yes	yes	yes	7

5. (e) THE MULTICULTURAL PROGRAM

The following multicultural education programs are currently in operation in DISD.

(1) American Indian Education Program

The American Indian Education Program is a supplementary program specifically designed to meet the needs of American Indian students through a program of counseling, tutoring and community involvement as well as resource development. This federally funded program, under Title IV of the Indian Education Act of 1972, has as its primary goal help for American Indian students in achieving personal and academic success. Goal accomplishment is primarily achieved through parent involvement in more than 118 schools that have some 815 American Indian students enrolled throughout the district. Program activities are coordinated by the program coordinator, Ms. Deanna Cheskewalla, and an Advisory Committee consisting of sixteen parents and two students. The advisory group disseminates information regarding advisory committee meetings, parent workshops, curriculum materials, instructional resource materials and historical and cultural events.

(2) Cultural Crossroads Educational Center

The Cultural Crossroads Educational Center, located at Urban Park Elementary School, is in its second year of operation and provides an instructional facility that benefits teachers, students, administrators and community members through a variety of cultural activities. Many program activities include a comprehensive study of different cultures, and emphasize the "confluence of cultures" in order to demonstrate the positive results of cultural diversity. Inservice workshops are conducted at the Center to increase the understanding of Center objectives and to foster

administrator and teacher understanding and appreciation of cultural plurality.

The Center uses a variety of different activities to achieve its objectives. Slide presentations, teacher and administrator handbooks, a Multicultural Arts Festival, field trips, workshops and presentations to community and civic groups are some of the activities of the Center. Unique to the Center are the U.S.A. Room, Texas Room and Dallas Room. Each room is furnished with artifacts and items of food, clothing, music, art, festivals and ceremonies which are representative of the Afro American, American Indian, Asian American, Euro American and Hispanic American cultures.

During the 1979-1980 academic year, a total of 1,569 sixth grade students and 62 teachers from ten schools (Burleson, Burnet, Caillet, Dorsey, Foster, Hotchkiss, Marcus, Preston Hollow, Rogers and Rowe) were instructed in cultural diversity. Center presentations are closely coordinated with the district's baseline curriculum, state-adopted textbooks, National Center for Curriculum Development, Mexican American Heritage Center and Bilingual Programs.

(3) The Ethnic Studies Program

The Ethnic studies program consists of three courses for secondary students. American Indian studies, Black American studies and Mexican American studies are designed to promote the understanding by students of their own heritage as well as the heritage of other people. Program offerings are also designed to involve students in cultural activities as though they might "live" the culture and thereby enhance the academic achievement

of participating students, help facilitate the development of a positive self-concept, and promote cultural appreciation. Program materials have been disseminated to 48 secondary schools, serving approximately 60,045 DISD students. Programs are scheduled upon request.

(4) The Multicultural Social Studies Program

The purpose of the Multicultural Social Studies Programs for K-6 students in 114 districtwide schools is to develop an appreciation for cultural diversity and to understand the meaning of the values of a pluralistic society. The program also promotes reading skills through written communication and research projects.

Empahsis is placed on cultural awareness, human relations, the enhancement of the self-concept, and a respect for the right of others to be "different." A variety of instructional strategies are used to facilitate program objectives. These include "hands-on" learning projects, open-ended questions, deductive and inductive reasoning, role-playing and case studies. Instructional strategies are complemented by the use of a variety of audio-visual materials and guest speakers.

The curriculum consists of a series of structured units each of which contains from two to nine activities. Each activity requires 30 to 40 minutes of instructional time. Units consist of an overview, table of contents, a statement of the main theme or objective and a vocabulary list.

(5) Packets of Reading Intercultural Strategies for Motivation (PRISM)

PRISM provides activities for K-3 students in Story Telling, Cuisine, Poetry, Music and Drama. The program serves 200 students at both Johnson and Travis Elementary schools. The thrust of the program is to motivate

student interest in reading and to promote a positive self-concept by providing culturally relevant activities to which a student can relate.

Program activities are designed to provide teachers and students the opportunity to share a mutual interaction and involvement in intercultural experiences through a variety of reading packets. PRISM activities incorporate the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor development of the child. The affective domain is developed by sequential concepts relating to the values of the individual, the family, the community and the world. Cognitive development emphasizes reading skills such as access of words, fluency and understanding. Psychomoto. skill development comes through various activities requiring the overall use of coordination and dexterity.

(6) Title VII Computer-Assisted Instructional Project (CAI)

The CAI is a supplementary bilingual (Spanish and English) language system designed for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students to increase reading achievement. Four (4) teachers and approximately 87 third-grade students at Allen Elementary school are participating in CAI activities.

As a testing model, its purpose is to test a set of curriculum materials for computer use in computer-assisted instruction. The Title VII project utilizes two state-adopted reading systems, the Bilingual Oral Language and Reading (BOLAR) and the Region One Literacy Lessons (ROLL). Parents are involved and the parents assume the role of partners in learning with their children. Parent conferences, monthly Advisory Committee meetings (parent-led discussion sessions on topics of interest), and parent workshops foster program development and parent-teacher interest in reading achievement.

(7) Title VII ESEA National Center for the Development of Bilingual Curriculum - Dallas

The Center is developing linguistically and culturally relevant curriculum materials to supplement bilingual classroom instruction in grades six through eight. The materials provide a thorough review of selected baseline skills and concepts in language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. They include multicultural career-oriented kits which integrate career education with basic skills and subject content. Kits of both English and Spanish were developed independently with common objectives and comparable learning activities.

The career-oriented curriculum seeks to help students understand the value of learning, increase students' language proficiency, encourage scholastic success and promote career awareness, preparation and decision making. Sixth grade materials were being pilot tested in fifteen (15) DISD schools with fifteen (15) teachers and approximately 300 students.

The Center's curriculum design has provided for parent involvement through its Extension to Home and Community component. Parents are given the opportunity to assist students in relating to the home and community information which is obtained in the classroom. Moreover, the Center is one of 42 support service projects located throughout the nation. This national network of bilingual centers support each other in instructional efforts through an interchange of knowledge and instructional materials.

6. The number and percentage of teachers by ethnicity assigned full time in each educational center, including Vanguard Schools, Academies, and Magnet High Schools.

Responsibilities of the Auditor were twofold: (1) Verify the ethnicity and campus assignment of building-level administrators, and (2) verify the number and percentage of classroom teachers, by ethnicity and campus assignment, as reported to the Court in the December 15, 1979 report. To facilitate the Auditor's responsibilities, a 5% random sample of both campus-level administrators and teachers was selected from computerized printouts which were provided, upon request, by Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel for the Dallas Independent School District. A table of random numbers was used to facilitate the drawing of the sample. The names that were drawn were subsequently submitted to Mr. Morgan, who provided the Auditor with the personnel files of the randomly selected teachers and administrators for the purpose of verifying their ethnicity as well as their job and campus assignment.

Personnel file folders of nineteen (19) campus-level administrators out of a total of 382, representing a 5% sample, were examined first. In the northwest subdistrict, Hillcrest High School, Jefferson High School, Pinkston High School, Walker Middle School, Arlington Park Elementary School, Milam Elementary School and Withers Elementary School were selected. Northeast subdistrict schools chosen for verification purposes included Madison High School, Gaston Middle School, and Lipscomb Elementary School. Schools in the southeast subdistrict were Lincoln High School and Comstock Middle School. The southwest subdistrict schools included Carter High

School, Browne Middle School, and Lee Elementary School. A. Maceo Smith High School, Stone Middle School, Bryan Elementary School, and Mills Elementary School were the schools in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict which constituted the sample.

Each personnel file folder of building-level administrators was examined to verify ethnicity, job assignment and the campus to which each administrator was assigned. No discrepancies existed between the data appearing on the computer printout and the data contained within the personnel file folder as of March 7, 1980.

The random sampling technique was also employed to select a 5% sample of full-time teachers employed in each of the six subdistrict schools. A total of 315 personnel file folders were examined by the Auditor. Sampling procedures were facilitated by a special computerized printout with specified characteristics as requested from and subsequently provided by Mr. William Morgan.

In the northwest subdistrict, out of a total of 1,179 full-time teachers, 59 personnel files were selected for verification purposes. The northeast subdistrict had 1,221 teachers listed as being employed full time. A sample of 61 teacher files were drawn for examination. In the southwest subdistrict where there were 1,166 full-time teachers employed, 58 were drawn by random sampling. Forty-four file folders out of 879 were selected to be verified in the southeast subdistrict. Out of the 1,030 teachers in the East Oak Cliff subdistrict, 52 files were selected. The subdistrict of Seagoville, having 114 teachers, had five (5) teacher file folders checked.

Special and Alternative Schools (including Vanguards, Academies and Magnets) had a total of 706 full-time teachers; a total of 36 personnel folders were drawn for inspection. Only one personnel file folder could not be located to verify reported information on the computerized printout. The folder in question represented one teacher in the southwest subdistrict. However, teacher employment verification was made through payroll verification checks and a telephone confirmation with the building administration where the teacher was assigned. To this end, DISD's faculty and administrator accounting procedures are found to be extremely accurate.

There was a difference in the total number of teachers reported to the Court in the December 15, 1979 report and the number shown on the computer printout provided for audit purposes. The computer printout taken from the computer and used in the December Court report listed 6,300 full-time teachers employed in the DISD on September 19, 1979. The computer printout given to the Auditor and dated January 29, 1980 contained 6,295 names of full-time teachers. The discrepancy of five (5) teachers occurred between September and January and was well within the 5% variance allowed by the Court.

7. The progress toward affirmative action in attaining the recruiting and employment goals, including the numbers and percentage of new teachers and administrators by ethnicity engaged by the DISD.

On March 28, 1980 a member of the audit team conducted interviews with the following DISD administrators: Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel; Mr. Edward L. Cowens, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Personnel; and Dr. Manuela Pruneda, Assistant Director of Personnel. These interviews were conducted for the purpose of verifying the adherence of affirmative action procedures in the areas of recruitment and employment of new teachers and new administrators. During these sessions district policies and practices regarding the recruitment and assignment of personnel were also discussed.

During the March 28, 1980 interview sessions the Auditor verified the comprehensiveness of the district's college and university recruiting program by examining copies of their geographic recruitment schedules and travel reimbursement forms. A total of twenty-three (23) institutions of higher learning was visited by one or more members of the Dallas Independent School District's Department of Personnel. Within the state of Texas, a total of nine (9) colleges and/or universities was visited by DISD recruiters. In addition to recruiting efforts within the state, personnel interviewers traveled to Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Washington, Arkansas, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Indiana, Louisiana, and Iowa to find qualified teachers. Approximately 21 colleges and universities were visited within the eleven-state area. Recruiting efforts included three new states (Colorado, Washington and Arizona) during the 1979-1980 academic year. In

all, approximately 1,500 prospective teachers were interviewed during the 1979-1980 recruiting period.

Additional efforts to recruit minority applicants included the use of brief radio announcements over approximately twenty (20) different stations (three more stations than those used the previous year) and recruiting advertisements which appeared in twenty-one (21) separate newspapers (six more papers than those appearing in the 1979-1980 operational year) throughout the state of Texas and included the dates and locations of interview centers for minority applicants. The Dallas Independent School District also belongs to the Massachusetts Educational Recruiting Consortium (MERC), which circulates information concerning minority teacher and administrator openings as well as interview schedules for interested applicants throughout the entire New England region.

A slide-tape presentation, updated during the 1978-1979 academic year, entitled "We've Got What You Want," accompanied by an updated brochure stressing the multicultural composition of the Dallas Independent School District, was circulated for viewing throughout Texas and in Boston, Massachusetts at the annual MERC convention. In several Texas cities such as Corpus Christi, Kingsville, Midland, Odessa, El Paso, Harlingen, Laredo and Del Rio, space in motels was rented by personnel interviewers to facilitate the recruitment of prospective teachers who found it inconvenient to attend designated interview centers at local university and college campuses. The overall cost of recruiting efforts for qualified applicants during the 1979-1980 recruiting season amounted to $24,834.54.

The number of newly employed teachers by the Dallas Independent School District was reported as being 577 in the December 15, 1979 report. By ethnicity, the report stated that there were 427 Anglo teachers (74%), 92 Black teachers (16%), 58 Hispanic teachers (10%). No administrators were employed during this reporting period. In an effort to verify the data reported to the Court, the Auditor requested Mr. William Morgan, Director of Personnel, to provide a copy of the computer printout containing the names, ethnicity, and campus assignments of those newly employed teachers and administrators who were included in the data presented to the Court on December 15, 1979. Close examination of the computerized printout as compared to the figures in the December report yielded no discrepancy between the two sets of data.

Verification of newly hired teachers and administrators, by ethnicity, as reported to the Court in the April 15, 1980 report was obtained. The verification of these figures was accomplished through an interview by the Auditor with Mr. William Morgan. A second verification of employment figures was accomplished by means of a computerized list of newly hired teachers (208) and administrators (0), by ethnicity.

In an interview on May 23, 1980 with Mr. Edward L. Cowens, Deputy Associate Superintendent-Personnel, the Auditor was informed that assignment practices are made in accordance with the Singleton case. However, if needs arise whereby the staffing of minority teachers becomes necessary for the overall enrichment of the educational program of the school, the Dallas Independent School District exercises its discretion to assign minority teachers at variance with the percentages established by Singleton. Mr.

Cowens also stated that teacher-selection "screening" procedures for the 1979-1980 operational year included the use of both the Wesman Classification Test and the Personnel Services Test (a test recently developed by DISD's Research and Development Component). Use of the National Teachers Examination as an index for employment is no longer a consideration. Test scores, along with interviews, college transcripts and other relevant data are used as the primary basis for teacher selection and subsequent employment in the DISD.

8. The current status of capital outlay projects and allocation of bond issue funds in relation to the priorities and programs established by this order.

For the December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 reports to the Court the DISD elected to follow a different reporting format than had been used in previous years in reporting capital outlay projects. In other portions of the Court reports in previous years, the term "status" was interpreted by the district to be a mere listing of programs or projects without further comment. Apparently the same definition has now applied to the capital outlay question as well. The term "current status" was followed by a listing of projects and with dates each "was commenced" or "comple ed" in both the December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 reports to the Court. The projects listed were those authorized by the Court Order of September 23, 1976 and the December 11, 1976 bond issue. A further descriptor was a statement which alluded to the "...current status of projects which commenced work since the last report to the Court." No further information was provided; even the source of authorization for the projects and the amount of monies allocated for each were omitted.

The DISD elected to report such bare data that little interpretation is possible. The Court would be better informed if each listed project would be followed by a description of what was to be accomplished, how much of the project has been completed, how much work was yet to be done for those not completed, how much money was allocated for each project, cost over-runs for any project where such would apply, anticipated dates for completion of projects yet unfinished, and an explanation of any problems encountered with each project. In previous years the Auditor gathered some of the aforementioned

information to serve as additional data to the Court and to serve as a model for information needed by the Court; however, the district did not elect to follow the example.

Personnel changes have occurred in some divisions and departments where capital outlay information is generated. Members of the audit team attempted on several occasions to locate sources for additional information to facilitate interpretation of information in the Court reports. A report called "DISD School Improvement Program Construction Progress Report Chart, May 19, 1980" was provided by Mr. Paul Arnold, Jr. The report was a partial list of the projects listed in the Court report. Each project assignment provided the date the project was started, contract completion date, the percent of the project which should be completed, the percent of the project which had actually been completed, and the estimated completion date. Absent from the report was any financial information about each project. Terms such as "renovation", "new construction", and "additions" were included for some projects. Further inquiry revealed that "renovation" could include minor changes costing as little as $500.00 to major renovation costing thousands of dollars.

The Auditor believes that capital outlay information contained in both the December 15, 1979 and April 15, 1980 reports to the Court does not meet the intent of the phrasing of question eight (8) on page twenty (20) of the Court Order which implies a <u>progress report</u> showing status in relation to time and other factors previously mentioned in this section of the audit report and in audit reports of previous years.

9. The results of the annual standardized achievement tests program by school, grade (grades 2, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 12), and ethnicity.

The results of the district's system-wide spring 1979 administration of achievement tests, reported by subdistrict, school, grade, sex and ethnicity were included in the Appendix D of the December 1979 DISD report to the Court. Student test results, presented to the Court in this format only, provide no accurate source for comparison of student growth from previous years nor any index for accountability and correlation purposes.

The Court is referred to page 3 of the June 15, 1979 Audit Report. The following paragraph is quoted in its entirety from page 3:

"The test data that were reported in this year's district compliance report to the Court were included in the December 15, 1978 report. The district-wide achievement testing program was changed from fall administration to a spring administration in the school year 1977-78, shifting the testing originally expected in the fall of 1977 to the spring of 1978. Thus there was a lapse of over a year when no test results were available. Different tests with a different reporting format were introduced at this time. Because of the change of phase testing, the use of different tests, and a variation in the score reporting format, it is not possible for the Auditor to utilize existing test data for the purpose of comparing average test performance year-to-year in the present Audit Report to the Court. The Auditor did not observe any effort by the district to implement appropriate statistical bridges in test reporting as included in Recommendation 3 of the June 15, 1978 Audit Report."

Information recently provided the Auditor by the Research and Evaluation Department indicates the DISD is fully aware of the statement quoted and of Recommendation 3 in the June 15, 1978 Audit Report. From this information the Auditor has the understanding the Research and Evaluation Department is moving to comply with the recommendation implied in the 1979 Audit Report that statistical bridges and other procedures be developed so that the results from the annual standardized testing program can be compared in a meaningful fashion from one year to another. As yet these studies and procedures have not been completed. Therefore, the Auditor can make no interpretation of gain or loss in test performance over the period covered by the Court Order.

To repeat the statement of the problems, the DISD has not only changed testing phase from fall to spring testing during the period of the Court Order but also the tests used to measure student achievement. Since results from different tests and from different test phases are usually not directly comparable, the district is urged to complete the necessary statistical studies in order to be able to comply fully with the intent of the Court Order that student test score data be assessed over time for any gains or losses which may have occurred.

It is possible for the Auditor to comment on the accuracy of the scoring and reporting processes for the spring 1979 testing, even though individual student test answer sheets had been destroyed by the time the Auditor was ready to verify the test results reported to the Court in Appendix D of the DISD December 1979 report. Since the Auditor was unable to verify the accuracy of the original source documents (test answer

sheets), it was decided to verify the scoring and reporting process. To facilitate this effort, the Auditor asked Mr. Richard Mallett, Senior Analyst for Test Processing, to verify test scoring and reporting procedures on May 21, 1980. Test scoring and reporting procedures, using computer tape, were shown to be accurate. Since these procedures were accurate, it must therefore be assumed that test results presented to the Court are also accurate.

10. Efforts made by the DISD to implement the order of the Court in the following areas:

(a) Parental Involvement Efforts

1. In an interview with Ms. Sandra D. Malone, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Community Relations, on May 5, 1980 the Auditor verified the existence and implementation of the Partners in Learning program. The program provides instructional materials for student-parent home use for students in grades K-3, 4-6 and 7-8. Primarily an instructional "packet" program, materials are used by adult volunteers in approximately 53 learning centers to supplement regular classroom instruction in reading, writing and mathematics. This program is a coordinated effort to encourage the parent to assist the teacher in strengthening the basic skills of each student. The Advocate Program, formally known as Partners in Reading, is one such part of this districtwide effort to supplement regular classroom instruction.

2. The Title I Parental Involvement Program is a program that involves the use of thirty-two (32) visiting teachers, thirteen (13) para-professionals, a variety of parent volunteers, and parent ombudsmen to provide direct assistance to Title I students and parents. Each educational center having Title I student enrollees has a Parent Advisory Council which is designed to facilitate home-school communication and foster parent-teacher cooperation. Monthly parent meetings are held at each Title I campus throughout the academic year. A total of two workshops is conducted which focus on the goals and objectives of the many aspects of Title I programs as well as the need for and suggested use of parental involvement in the instructional program.

3. Originally a Title IV, Part C grant, the Parent Education Project serves as the coordinating agent for some twenty-seven (27) parent-participating programs. Some such programs include Partners in Learning, Education for Parenthood, and Sex Education.

4. The Parent Materials and Information Center, located at Dunbar Community Learning Center, is the focal point for project activities and houses a wide variety of books, films and an assortment of brochures for both parent and community use. Through the Parent Programs Coordinating Council, timely topics of interest are presented at each monthly meeting. Agendas are open and all interested "publics" are invited to participate in a free interchange of ideas.

5. Additional dissemination efforts have been made by DISD personnel. For example, both English and Spanish versions of the district's calendar of events have been printed and distributed to parents. A brochure entitled "Example is the Best Precept - A Guide to Community and Parent Involvement in the K-6 School," was disseminated to campus administrators, community specialists, and home-school coordinators. A film strip and tape presentation, "Helping Your Child in Grades K-6", is available for viewing to both parents and community members.

(b) The Staff Development Program

1. In an effort to develop the skills of school administrators and educational leaders within DISD, a Leadership Training Program exists. Each school year, approximately twenty-five (25) applicants are selected to participate in training activities which qualifies them for an administrative assignment within the district. Selected applicants must hold a

master's degree and have completed the majority of course work necessary for a Texas administrator's certificate. Every leadership trainee is required to successfully complete a four (4) phase program. Phase one , the recruitment and selection phase, concentrates on screening and interviewing prospective candidates. Phase two focuses on classroom instruction and seminars in urban administration conducted by three area universities. The third phase of the program is a summer internship in an area appropriate to participants' career goals. Phase four, a year-long internship, is then undertaken by the trainee in either a campus or central office setting.

2. The Management Academy provides comprehensive inservice training programs for all campus-level administrators and those phase four interns participating in the Leadership Training Program. Located at North Dallas High School, the Academy is the central training area for all principals, assistant principals, deans of instruction and interns. Classroom instruction, coordinated between DISD personnel and nine local colleges and universities, concentrates on two-way communication techniques, problem solving, administrative theory and management techniques, and urban school organization problems.

3. From July 31 through August 3, 1979, the annual DISD Administrators' Conference was held at Skyline High School. Both general meeting and small workshop sessions focused on such topics as Texas Assessment of Basic Skills, techniques and strategies for teaching reading, and inservice topics for campus workshops. School board policies and administrative regulations were also reviewed along with changes in DISD's staffing organization.

4. An orientation conference was conducted for all teachers new to the district during August 15 through 17, 1979. Approximately 450 new teachers participated in program activities that were designed to acquaint them with the baseline curriculum, personnel services, staff development requirements, discipline code and procedures, and student assessment instruments. An entire day was devoted to the operational policies and procedures indigenous to each particular campus, through building-level cluster conferences.

5. and 6. DISD's Personnel Department is primarily responsible for developing and conducting both the Job-Alike Days and Personnel Development Courses for the district's professional employees. Both programs are designed to assist district personnel in meeting the state mandated 35 hours of inservice training. While the Job-Alike Days are largely teacher "share" sessions relating to teaching techniques and strategies "that worked", Personnel Development Courses primarily fall into three categories: practicums, conference/laboratories, and structured presentations.

7. Early Release Days, seven in number, were conducted by the district during the 1979-1980 operational year. The major thrust of these teacher-oriented inservice days focuses on programs that directly related to local building concerns and practices within each of the six subdistricts.

8. A total of four Teacher Education Centers has been established for the purpose of providing both preservice and inservice programs to student teachers and regular teachers alike. Through the cooperative efforts of the DISD and local university personnel, inservice programs were

conducted at each of the four centers: (1) Silberstein Elementary School, (2) Dunbar Elementary School, (3) Preston Hollow Elementary School, and (4) Hulcy Middle School. Inservice topics included the goals and objectives of competency-based teacher education, techniques and strategies for teaching students from multiple cultural heritages, and the duties and responsibilities of supervising pre-professional teachers. Title I staff training was also conducted during the 1979-1980 academic year.

9. Title I staff training, being comprehensive in scope consisted of regularly scheduled workshop sessions (August 13 through 17, 1979) plus forty (40) additional hours of supplemental training for all Title I teachers and aides. Program topics included demonstration teaching, student assessment techniques and the use of community members and parents as instructional/resource personnel.

(c) Communications and Community Relations

DISD has undertaken the following efforts to establish communication linkages and partnerships with community groups and organizations:

1-7. The Dallas Independent School District implemented a comprehensive community information network throughout the 1979-1980 school year. Community and Program Advisory committees met on a monthly basis to facilitate school-community communications regarding instructional goals and objectives. The Community Network for Public Education was organized for the purpose of coordinating the districtwide volunteer program which identified and represented eight community sectors. In an effort to capitalize on specialized strengths of community members, the Special Program for Additional Resources of Knowledge (SPARK) was organized through the efforts of the Women's Council of Dallas County. A SPARK coordinator was located at each campus, and local

resource personnel were identified and solicited to provide classroom presentations in their area of expertise to provide enrichment to regular classroom instruction. While approximately 322 business, civic and community groups provided instructional services, materials and volunteers to individual schools through the Adopt-A-School Program, the Learner Advocate Project (LAP) supplied adult volunteers to serve as tutors in the basic skill areas on a one-to-one basis.

8. Reading is FUNdamental programs, sponsored by some 102 businesses, religious and service organizations, focused on the use of lay volunteers and donated resource materials to improve reading levels of individual students.

9. and 10. A wide variety of business organizations throughout the community donated staff time, money and materials to support both the Youth Motivation and Junior Achievement programs. Community health volunteers, approximately one hundred in number, who are either registered nurses or individuals who have completed the Red Cross Training Program, provided medical assistance to students in approximately thirty (30) schools for one-half a day per week.

11. through 14. Community School Action Centers and the district's publication "Update" served as information resources to both parents and interested community members. Tours of "special" campuses such as Vanguards, Academies, and Magnet High Schools were conducted for both local and out-of-state visitors. Instructional goals and objectives as well as teaching materials and correlated instructional strategies were explained and demonstrated to each visitor group.

(d) Student Leadership Training Programs

1. and 2. Leaders Interested in the Future of Education (LIFE) is a student leadership program designed for total student involvement, stressing a positive working partnership between students, teachers, administrators and community members. The program is operational in all secondary schools and is conducted by campus facilitators who are responsible for student leadership seminars in the areas of group communications, decision making, problem solving, human relations and parliamentary procedure. The success of the program is generally determined by the actions and accomplishments of individual students in accordance with goal-setting aspirations. Furthermore, LIFE helps foster unity within the school, provides a communications network at the building level, and enhances student cooperation.

3. and 4. A leadership course, entitled Contemporary Student Leadership Development, is offered at eleven district high schools with a combined total of 582: 240 Anglo, 252 Black, 90 Hispanic students participated, which includes both SLD programs. The eleven high schools were: Bryan Adams, Carter, Kimball, North Dallas, Pinkston, Samuells, Skyline, South Oak Cliff, Spruce, A. Mace Smith, and Sunset.

Numerous training sessions and leadership development seminars were conducted by DISD personnel. City-wide services were designed specifically for 250 high school students while area-wide seminars were conducted for 713 middle school students. A staff development workshop was held for LIFE sponsors and instructors on August 22, 1979. Workshop activities, in which thirty-six sponsors and instructors participated, included information about implementation of new programs; provided an opportunity

for sponsors to share the results of successful projects and provided an opportunity for sponsors to critique program activities. A Newsgram was printed and distributed to leadership teams in each secondary school in an effort to further disseminate publicity regarding service projects and programs.

(e) Safety and Security (including Due Process Procedures)

DISD has established the following safety and s curity procedures:

An interview conducted on April 25, 1980 with Mr. Travis Johnson, Director of Transportation, confirmed that there were approximately 400 buses with two-way radios and verified the presence of a radio and telephone communications command post in operation at the central school administration building. Moreover, the City of Dallas continued to install safety signals and the Dallas County School Transportation Office continually monitored and maintained operating procedures with transportation vehicles. Mr. Johnson further verified that DISD's transportation department conducted investigations of all bus timetable violations and service complaints. As an additional safety feature, volunteer monitors rode designated bus routes when specific requests were generated from the office of the school principal. Each campus administrator was provided a two-way radio to communicate directly with Mr. Johnson's office concerning safety and security situations. When the necessity existed, central office administrators monitored transportation routes and assisted regular personnel in driving transportation vehicles.

Dr. George Reid, Assistant Superintendent-Secondary Learning, related on April 29, 1980 that additional measures were taken to assure the safety

of DISD students while on each attending campus when requested. Both the Youth Action Center and the Office of School Security provided personnel to monitor daily campus activities. Professional instructional personnel also monitored campus areas on a regular basis as part of contractual duties. Furthermore, the Office of Student Services provided a comprehensive and up-to-date monitoring of student discipline and served as the interface agent between DISD and county and federal officials in an on-going effort to develop and implement alternative models of discipline and education for chronic offenders.

No delineation of Due Process procedures and policies was presented to the Court in either the December or April report. The Auditor notes that the DISD reports to the Court for both December and April merely state that, "Due process procedures exist in the District." No definition of "Due process" or of "Due process procedures" has yet been made available to the Auditor to use in an independent determination of whether due process procedures are being followed in the district.

THE PARENT - STUDENT ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

The External Auditor sought to obtain some direct information about the effect of DISD school desegregation efforts as perceived by the parents of some of the students involved. A short interview schedule was designed and utilized for interviews with a small sample of parents. The results of this survey, conducted during the latter part of May 1980, are presented in Table 6.

The responsibility of the Auditor, under agreement with the Court, was to select only 25 families for interviews. The Auditor, concerned that this sample was too small, extended the efforts to reach a total of seventy-five families. A portion of this sample was selected randomly from among all schools visited; the remainder was selected purposely to supplement information obtained in interviews with students.

Of the sample of seventy-five families, the audit team was unable to contact or complete interviews with thirteen families. The results that follow, therefore, represent responses from sixty-two parents -- twenty-four Anglo, nineteen Black and nineteen Hispanic.

The survey, presented in questionnaire format, was composed of eighteen questions. The instrument included five basic areas of concern: (1) the general educational atmosphere; (2) the degree of parental involvement; (3) the perceived progress toward desegregation; (4) the quality of the curriculum, the teachers and the administration; and (5) the nature and scope of extracurricular offerings. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix E.

The overall reaction of those sampled was generally favorable to the Court-ordered desegregation program. With eleven or fewer exceptions,

parents interviewed indicated satisfaction with their child's educational progress (Item #1 of the Attitudinal Survey Questionnaire) and confirmed that their child liked his/her school (#10). Without exception, all parents had visited their child's school (#6). The great majority found that both the course offerings and curriculum were adequate (#8 and #16), as were the extracurricular offerings (#17) and their child's participation in such activities (#18).

Highly positive reactions were also expressed with regard to parent satisfaction with the implementation of the desegretation plan (#2), child's gain in multicultural knowledge (#3), and the adequacy of facilities (#9). A sizeable majority of parents surveyed also indicated an awareness of the Majority to Minority Program (#4). A slightly smaller majority of parents surveyed indicated that desegregation had resulted in an improved educational atmosphere (#5).

Parent reaction to the question of improved administrative and teacher quality at the child's new school (#11 and #12) was mixed and approximately one-third of those interviewed said they did not know if a difference existed.

Parents' reactions were more negative than positive with respect to the adequacy of transportation (#13). Specific criticisms included overcrowding, inadequate number of buses, discipline problems, unqualified drivers, undependable schedules, frequent breakdowns and no student protection from bad weather.

With regard to discipline, parent reaction was again mixed with almost one-third failing to express an opinion. A very slight majority of parents agreed that there were fewer discipline problems in their child's new

school (#14). Parents expressing an opinion with respect to severity of punishment at the child's new school vs. his old school were equally divided (#15).

Results of the Parent Attitudinal Survey also attest to the fact that a slight majority of the parents surveyed was active in parent organizations (#7). Reasons offered for lack of involvement included job and other commitments, small children at home and lack of transportation.

TABLE 6

PARENT ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

Questions	Grade Level	Response by Ethnicity: Yes A	Yes B	Yes Hisp.	No A	No B	No Hisp.	Total Yes	Total No	Total No Answers	Grand Total
1. Satisfaction with education progress	K-3	6	4	6	0	1	1				
	4-6	8	5	7	1	4	1				
	7-8	1	2	2	2	0	0				
	9-12	6	2	2	0	1	0	51	11	0	62
2. Satisfaction with desegregation implementation	K-3	3	2	4	2	2	1				
	4-6	5	7	8	3	1	1				
	7-8	0	2	2	3	0	0				
	9-12	4	3	2	2	0	0	42	15	5	62
3. Multicultural knowledge with desegregation	K-3	3	4	6	3	1	1				
	4-6	7	6	7	1	3	1				
	7-8	2	2	2	0	0	0				
	9-12	3	2	2	3	1	0	46	14	2	62
4. Awareness of majority to minority program	K-3	3	4	4	3	1	3				
	4-6	6	7	7	3	2	1				
	7-8	0	2	2	3	0	0				
	9-12	3	2	2	3	1	0	42	20	0	62
5. Improved educational atmosphere with desegregation	K-3	2	4	4	3	0	0				
	4-6	3	4	8	4	3	0				
	7-8	2	8	2	0	1	0				
	9-12	0	0	1	0	0	0	38	11	13	62
6. Visitation to new school	K-3	6	5	7	0	0	0				
	4-6	9	9	8	0	0	0				
	7-8	3	2	2	0	0	0				
	9-12	6	3	2	0	0	0	62	0	0	62
7. Active participation in parent organization	K-3	4	2	6	2	3	1				
	4-6	6	3	5	3	6	3				
	7-8	0	1	1	1	1	2				
	9-12	5	1	1	1	2	1	35	26	1	62
8. Adequate course offerings	K-3	6	5	7	1	0	0				
	4-6	9	7	8	0	2	0				
	7-8	1	2	1	0	0	1				
	9-12	6	2	2	1	1	0	56	6	0	62
9. Adequate facilities	K-3	5	4	6	1	1	0				
	4-6	7	7	5	2	1	3				
	7-8	2	1	1	0	0	1				
	9-12	4	1	1	2	1	1	44	13	5	62
10. Child's satisfaction	K-3	6	5	7	0	0	0				
	4-6	9	7	8	0	2	0				
	7-8	1	2	2	2	0	0				
	9-12	6	2	2	0	1	0	57	5	0	62
11. Better teaching quality at new school	K-3	3	2	2	1	0	4				
	4-6	3	3	4	4	2	4				
	7-8	0	1	0	2	0	0				
	9-12	6	1	0	2	0	2	25	21	16	62
12. Better administrative quality at new school	K-3	3	1	4	1	1	1				
	4-6	6	2	3	2	3	2				
	7-8	0	0	0	0	0	1				
	9-12	5	1	0	1	2	2	25	16	21	62
13. Adequate transportation facilities	K-3	2	1	3	2	1	4				
	4-6	3	4	2	6	4	2				
	7-8	3	1	2	0	1	0				
	9-12	2	1	1	4	2	1	25	27	10	62

TABLE 6 (Con't.)

14. Fewer discipline problems at new school	K-3	3	1	?	1	1	4				
	4-6	1	4	4	5	3	1				
	7-8	2	1	3	0	1	0				
	9-12	3	1	2	3	1	0	24	20	18	62
15. Milder punishments at new school	K-3	3	1	2	2	1	4				
	4-6	3	2	3	3	3	1				
	7-8	0	1	0	0	1	0				
	9-12	3	1	1	3	2	0	20	20	22	62
16. Adequate curriculum	K-3	6	5	7	0	0	0				
	4-6	8	7	8	1	2	0				
	7-8	0	2	1	0	0	1				
	9-12	5	3	1	1	0	1	53	6	3	62
17. Sufficient extracurricular offerings	K-3	6	4	5	0	0	1				
	4-6	7	7	6	2	1	0				
	7-8	0	2	1	0	0	0				
	9-12	6	?	1	0	0	1	47	5	10	62
18. Child's extracurricular participation	K-3	4	4	5	0	0	1				
	4-6	9	6	6	0	2	1				
	7-8	0	2	2	3	0	0				
	9-12	6	3	1	0	0	1	50	8	4	62

APPENDICES

SURVEY OF D. I. S. D. SCHOOLS

(in compliance with Court Order
CA-3-4211-C Item XV Sect: B_2).

Grade _____ to _____

Name of School _____ Principal _____

Address _____ Sub-District _____

Phone No.: _____ Capacity _____ Enrollment _____

Observer _____ Date _____

I STAFF

Teacher-Student Ratio _____ : Adult-Student Ratio: _____

	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
A. Teaching Staff					
Support Staff					
Students					

Comments _____

B. C-ff S (Composite) LIST OF STAFF

STAFF	Anglo	Black	Mexican-American	Other	Total
Principal					
Intern Admin/ Asst Principal					
Counselors					
Vocational Counselors					
Librarians					
Nurses					
Nurses Aides					
Special Ed. Teachers					
Vocational Teachers (Bonus)					
Orchestra Teacher					
Classroom Teachers					
Classroom Teachers (Bonus)					
Registrar					
Study Hall Teachers					
Milita. Personnel					
Min. Fund. Prog. Aide					
Aides in Lieu of Teachers					
Other Teacher Aides					
Secretaries					
Library Clerks					
Attendance/ Principal Clerks					
Building/Data Processing Clerk					
Counselor Clerks					
Research & Evaluation Observer					
Campus Officers					
Comm. Relations Cluster Staff					
Dir. Development					
Resource Teachers					
Liaison					
Youth Advisor					

94

C. EVALUATION: D.I.S.D. Principal-Teacher Conference

Comments _____

_____

D. ASSIGNMENTS: D.I.S.D. No. _____ Principal _____ No. _____

Comments _____

_____

E. TRANSFERS: IN _____ OUT _____

Comments _____

_____

F. CERTIFICATION: All _____ Some _____ Special Teaching Permit _____

Comments _____

_____

G. DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Principal's Copy ___ Implementation ___ No. of times per year ___

Content _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

H. COUNSELORS: No. of Students Counseled Requirement ___ Exit ___ Entrance ____

Magnets _____ Career Development Centers ____ Curriculum Transfers ___

Majority-Minority Transfer _____ Minority-Majority Transfer _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

II STUDENTS

A. ATTENDANCE: Actual _____ December Report _____ _____

B. DISCIPLINE:	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
Corporal Punishment					
Counseling					
Parent Conferences					
Suspensions (1-3 days)					
Juvenile Court Referrals					
Alternative Ed. Programs					
Third Party					

Comments _____

_____

_____

C. CURRICULUM TRANSFERS

Comments _____

_____

_____

D. READING LEVELS

2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
10				
12				

Comments _____

_____

E. INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

GRADES					
	K				
	1				
	2				
	3				
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	9				
	10				
	11				
	12				

Comments _____

_____

_____

F. STUDENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Anglo	Black	M-A	Other	Total

Comments

G. EXTRA-CURRICULAR PROGRAM

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Anglo	Black	M-A	Other	Total

Comments

R.O.T.C.

Comments

III. CURRICULUM

A. BASELINE SUBJECTS

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grades
Language Arts														
Social Studies														
Mathematics														
Science														

Comments

B. CAREER EDUCATION COURSES

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Industrial Cooperative Training									
Distributive Education									
Vocational Office Education									
Coop. Vocational Adv. Education									
Home Economic Coop Education									
Health Occupation									
Cosmetology									
Pre-Employment Child Care									
Auto-Mechanics									
General Contracting (CVA)									
Radio-TV									

Comments _____

C. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

How implemented?

Comments _____

D. HONORS

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total

Comments _____

E. FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

E.S.E.A. TITLE I									
	II								
	III								
	IV								
	VI								
	VII								
Bilingual Reading									
Tutoring									
TITLE I Deaf Project									
Project Kids									
Career Education									

Comments _____

F. MULTI-CULTURAL STUDIES

SUBJECTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grades

Comments _____

_____

_____

G. PARTNERS IN READING

	Anglo	%	Black	%	M-A	%	Other	%	Total
Students									
Parents									
Parents Involvement									
Parent Advocates									
Parent Adv. Needed									

Comments _____

_____

_____

H. PHOTOTYPIC ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

	YES	NO
Mexican American Heritage Center	____	____
Afro-American Heritage Center	____	____
Ecological Center	____	____
Oral Language Lab	____	____
Educational Tours	____	____

Comments _____

_____

_____

IV FACILITIES

MEASUREMENT SCALE

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Adequate
4. Inadequate
5. Poor

0 Non-Existent
N.A. Not Applicable

OBSERVER: _____

EXTERNAL FEATURES

A. GROUNDS

1. General Appearance ___
2. Landscaping ___
3. Sidewalks ___
4. Pathways ___
5. Parking Area ___
6. Fencing ___
7. Lighting ___
8. Recreational Area ___
9. Recreational Equipment ___
10. Sign posts ___
11. Security ___
12. Garbage Receptacles ___

B. BUILDINGS

1. General Appearance ___
2. Lighting ___
3. Brickwork ___
4. Woodwork ___
5. Trimmings ___
6. Roofing ___
7. Security ___
8. Gutters ___
9. Drainage ___
10. Ducts-ventilation ___
-exhaust ___
11. Safety ___
12. Windows ___

Name of Observer _____

Date of Observation _____

INTERNAL FEATURES

C. INTERIOR

1. General Appearance
2. Lighting
3. Walls (painted)
4. Hallways
5. Lockers
6. Offices
7. Garbage Receptacles
8. Dining Facilities
9. Doors
10. Drinking Fountains
11. Space Allocation
12. Rest Rooms
13. Plumbing
14. Heating System
15. Electrical System
16. Air Conditioning
17. Ventilation
18. Stairways
19. Balconies
20. Library
21. Notice/Poster Boards
22. Furnishings
23. Storage Areas
24. Fire Exits
25. Fire Extinguisher
26. Gymnasium (Male & Female)

D. CLASSROOM

1. General Appearance
2. Lighting
3. Safety
4. Doors
5. Identification Symbols
6. Security
7. Carpeting
8. Floors
9. Waste Baskets
10. Windows
11. Ventilation
12. Heating Cooling System
13. Air Conditioning
14. Electrical Outlets
15. Equipment-Mobile
-Stationary
16. Chalkboards
17. Notice/Poster Boards
18. Cupboards
19. Bookshelves
20. Chairs
21. Desks
22. Space Allocation
23. Storage Area
24. Fire Extinguishers

V. TRANSPORTATION

ACTUAL _____ DECEMBER REPORT _____ IN _____ OUT _____

A. STUDENTS

	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
Schools					
Vanguards					
Academies					
Business Magnet					
Arts					
Health Professions					
Transportation					

Comments _____

B. TRANSFER PROGRAM
(Majority to Minority)

Schools				

Comments _____

C. FACILITIES

Type 72 Seater				
D.I.S.D.				
Mini-				

Comments _____

VI. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

PROGRAMS	Anglo %	Black %	M-A %	Other %	Total
P.T.A.					
P.T.S.A.					
Adopt A School					
Athletic Booster					
Parent Advisory					
Volunteer					
Parental Involvement					
Tutors					
R.I.F.					

Comments _____

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Comments _____

BILINGUAL

	ANGLO	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	OTHER	TOTAL
Students	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aides	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

CERTIFICATION: _____ ALL _____ IN PROCESS

LANGUAGE DOMINANCE: _____ SPANISH _____ TRANSITIONAL MAINTENANCE _____

MONOLINGUAL: _____ SPANISH _____ ENGLISH

NO. OF CLASSES: _____ IN SPANISH _____ IN ENGLISH

PROVISIONS FOR ESL:

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

ORAL WRITTEN DISD COMMERCIAL OTHER

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

MATERIALS

TYPE: AUDIOVISUAL PROGRAMMED SUPPLEMENTARY

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

	ANGLO	BLACK	MEXICAN-AMERICAN	OTHER	TOTAL
TUTORS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PARENTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
ADULTS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

Teacher's Legal Name

dallas independent school district

TEACHER EVALUATION

CONFIDENTIAL

RECOMMENDATION OF PRINCIPAL:

☐ The teacher is successfully fulfilling the instructional goals as established by Board-approved curriculum, as well as meeting the Professional expectations as described in this document, and is recommended for continued employment.

☐ The teacher's success in achieving the instructional goals of the District, and/or meeting the Professional expectations as outlined in this document is marginal. Continued employment is contingent upon successful fulfilling the requirements outlined. (Appendices will be attached to this document and shall contain prescriptive remedies for the correction of performance deficiencies as determined by the principal/evaluation team.)

☐ The teacher is unsuccessful in achieving the instructional goals of the District and/or the Professional expectations as outlined in this document and therefore is recommended for dismissal.

TEACHER'S STATEMENT:

A formal conference was held on (date) _____ with my principal.

I acknowledge that each of the Professional characteristics and instructional performances listed within was discussed and that specific suggestions were recommended. I understand that my signature below does not necessarily mean that I agree with the evaluation. I also understand that I have the right to discuss my status with the Assistant Superintendent — Personnel of the Dallas Independent School District.

Signed comments are attached by principal ☐ and/or teacher ☐

Date _____ Teacher's Signature _____

School _____ Teacher's Social Security No. _____

Principal's Signature _____

Teaching Assignment _____

Number of years of service, including this year, in this school _____

Current years of service, including this year, in the Dallas Independent School District _____

Total years of service in the teaching profession _____

Comments _____

104

I. PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION FORM

Teacher _____ School _____

I. PROFESSIONAL

	Successful	Marginal	Unsuccessful	COMMENTS
A The teacher maintains a continuous effort to achieve professional improvement, attitudes, and conduct. Also, the teacher observes professional ethics, works cooperatively with the entire staff, seeks, shares, and respects ideas of others, refrains from revealing confidential information regarding pupils and their families.	☐	☐	☐	
B The teacher supports established administrative policies and directives, and performs all required school routines and responsibilities on time.	☐	☐	☐	
C The teacher's absences are minimal and do not significantly impede the learning progress of students.	☐	☐	☐	
D The teacher is consistently fair and impartial, praise and criticism are based on fact, all criticism is constructive, individual pupils are not excessively criticized, the teacher avoids criticism which may result in any embarrassment.	☐	☐	☐	
E The teacher sets an example of, and encourages, socially acceptable behavior (e.g., dress, correct usage of speech, and manners), which results in an educational climate free of disruption.	☐	☐	☐	
F The teacher maintains an atmosphere conducive to freedom of thought and creative expression, and shows respect for pupil opinions and suggestions. He/She also fosters a positive self-concept in each pupil.	☐	☐	☐	
G The teacher demonstrates and communicates a vital interest in and understanding of each pupil's social, emotional, physical, and intellectual growth.	☐	☐	☐	

	Successful	Marginal	Unsuccessful	COMMENTS
H Classroom management is orderly and businesslike, and gives evidence of student knowledge of teacher expectations for routines and classroom procedure. The teacher resolves behavior problems with minimal disruptions to the learning climate and creates a teaching environment conducive to learning	☐	☐	☐	
I The teacher's condition of health enables the teacher to achieve the instructional goals of the District	☐	☐	☐	
J The teacher establishes and conducts a system of communication wherein the parents are able to interpret the periodic progress reports in terms of course goals, student level of achievement of these goals, reasons for student achievement, and means for continued progress	☐	☐	☐	

II. INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION RATING

A Appraisal of Original or Modified Goals (December of a school year)	☐	☐	☐
B Attainment of Original or Modified Goals (March 31 of a school year)	☐	☐	☐

Recommended Areas for Goal Development

Exceptional Professional Accomplishments

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

The initial step in the selection of school administrators is to invite all interested personnel to take the Leadership Training Program Examination which is given annually. A copy of this application form is enclosed. The Leadership Training Program is divided in four phases. Enclosed is a copy of the Leadership Training Program Handbook, which describes the purposes of the program, the criteria of selection, and description of the four phases of the program. The personnel who successfully complete this program are interviewed by the Assistant Superintendents-Operations, the Assistant Superintendent-East Oak Cliff, and the General Superintendent of Schools. Personnel are assigned by the General Superintendent according to the vacancies which exist at the time of selection.

Principals, Assistant Principals, Resource Administrators, and Interns are evaluated according to the procedures as outlined in the enclosed Administrators Professional Evaluation booklet.

APPLICATION FORM FOR THE
LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM
1978 - 1979
(Please type or print)

A recent photograph must be attached here

Date _____

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone-School _____ Telephone-Home _____

Age _____ Sex: M F Height _____ Weight _____

Ethnic Origin _____ Marital Status _____

Social Security Number _____

DALLAS EXPERIENCE

Position	School	Principal	Subjects Taught	Years

OUTSIDE EXPERIENCE

Position	School	City	Superintendent	Years

COLLEGES ATTENDED AND DEGREES RECEIVED

College and Location	Yrs. Attended	Dates	Degrees Received

State of Texas Certification ☐ Teachers ☐ Administrators ☐ Supervisors ☐ Counselors

Present Assignment: School _____ Subject _____

Position to which you aspire _____

Will you be available during the coming summer months? _____

Have you ever taken the Administrative-Supervisory Exam? _____ If so what date _____, and where is the score on file? _____

Have you ever taken the National Teachers Exam (Commons)? _____ If so what date _____, and where is the score on file? _____

Please enclose a check for $7.00 payable to the Dallas Independent School District to cover the cost of your examinations.

NOTE:

Director - Management Academy (two copies) Box 45

Building Principal (one copy)
Retain file copy

Appendix E

ATTITUDINAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ETS AUDIT - SPRING 1979

Date _____

Name _____ Address _____

Phone _____ Ethnicity _____

Subdistrict _____ Student Grade Level _____

School Transferred From _____

Kind of School: Check one. K-3 ( ); 4-5-6 ( ); 7-8 ( );
9-12 ( ); Academy ( ); Vanguard ( )

School Transferred To _____

Kind of School: Check one. K-3 ( ); 4-5-6 ( ); 7-8 ( );
9-12 ( ); Academy ( ); Vanguard ( )
Magnet ( )

1. Are you as a parent satisfied with your child's education progress at his school? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

2. Do you feel that the desegregation plan is working as well as it should be? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

3. Do you think that your child has benefitted in learning more about other ethnic groups through this desegration plan?
   Yes _____ No _____

4. Are you aware of the majority to minority movement currently going on within the school district? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you think the general educational atmosphere is better now than it was before the desegregation plan began?
   Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

6. Have you visited your child's new school? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

7. Are you active in parent organizations? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

8. Do you feel that there are enough courses being offered at your child's school to meet his/her needs? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

9. Do you feel that the school buildings, grounds, equipment, etc., are adequate? Yes _____ No _____

   If not, why not? _____

10. Does your child like the school that he/she is attending? Yes _____ No _____

11. Is the quality of teaching at the new school better than the quality of teaching at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

12. Is the quality of the administration at the new school better than the quality of administration at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

13. Are the transportation facilities adequate? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

14. Are there fewer discipline problems at the new school in comparison to those discipline problems at the old school? Yes _____ No _____

15. Are punishments less severe at the new school? Yes _____ No _____

16. Is the curriculum at the new school meeting your expectations and your child's needs? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

17. Are the extracurricular offerings at the school sufficient? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____

18. Is your child able to participate in these extracurricular offerings? Yes _____ No _____

    If not, why not? _____